

Exhibit B

Page 1

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
3 MDL No. 2875
4

5 -----x

6 IN RE:

7 VALSARTAN, LOSARTAN, AND
8 IRBESARTAN PRODUCTS LIABILITY
9 LITIGATION

10 -----x

11
12 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION OF
13 LAURA R. CRAFT
14 VIA ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE
15 January 12, 2023
16 8:00 a.m. PST
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Reported by:

24 Maureen Ratto, RPR, CCR
25

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p> <p>1 * * *</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 Videotape deposition of LAURA R.</p> <p>4 CRAFT held virtually via Zoom</p> <p>5 Teleconference, hosted from Veritext</p> <p>6 Legal Solutions, pursuant to notice,</p> <p>7 before Maureen Ratto, Certified Court</p> <p>8 Reporter, License No. XI01165,</p> <p>9 Registered Professional Reporter,</p> <p>10 License No. 817125, and Notary Public.</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 * * *</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p> <p>1 A P P E A R A N C E S, continued:</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 Counsel for Defendant - Humana</p> <p>4 Pharmacy, Inc.</p> <p>5 FALKENBERG IVES, LLP</p> <p>6 230 West Monroe</p> <p>7 Chicago, Illinois 60606</p> <p>8 BY: MEGAN A. ZMICK, ESQ.</p> <p>9 maz@falkenbergives.com</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 Counsel for Defendant - Torrent Pharma:</p> <p>12 KIRKLAND & ELLIS, LLP</p> <p>13 1601 Elm Street</p> <p>14 Dallas, Texas 75201</p> <p>15 BY: ALEXIA RENEE BRANCATO, ESQ.</p> <p>16 Alexia.brancato@kirkland.com</p> <p>17</p> <p>18 Counsel for Defendant - Albertson's,</p> <p>19 LLC:</p> <p>20 BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY, PC</p> <p>21 227 W Trade Street Carillon Tower</p> <p>22 Charlotte, North Carolina 28202</p> <p>23 BY: JONATHAN D. JANOW, ESQ.</p> <p>24 jonathan.janow@bipc.com</p> <p>25</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p> <p>1 A P P E A R A N C E S:</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 Counsel for the Plaintiff:</p> <p>4 KANMER & WHITELEY, LLC</p> <p>5 701 Camp Street</p> <p>6 New Orleans, Louisiana 70310</p> <p>7 BY: DAVID J. STANOCH, ESQ.</p> <p>8 d.stanoch@kanmer-law.com</p> <p>9 CONLEE S. WHITELEY, ESQ.</p> <p>10 c.whiteley@kanmer-law.com</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 Counsel for the Plaintiff:</p> <p>13 MEYER WILSON CO., LPA</p> <p>14 900 Camp Street</p> <p>15 New Orleans, Louisiana</p> <p>16 BY: LAYNE HILTON, ESQ.</p> <p>17 lhilton@meyerhilton.com</p> <p>18</p> <p>19 Counsel for the Plaintiff - MSP</p> <p>20 Recovery Law Firm:</p> <p>21 RIVERO MESTRE, LLP</p> <p>22 2525 Ponce de Leon</p> <p>23 Coral Gables, Florida 33134</p> <p>24 BY: ZALMAN KASS, ESQ.</p> <p>25 JORGE MESTRE, ESQ.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 A P P E A R A N C E S, continued:</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 Attorneys for Defendant - Mylan N.V.:</p> <p>4 PIETROGALLO GORDON ALFANO BOSCIK &</p> <p>5 RASPANTI, LLP</p> <p>6 301 Grant Street</p> <p>7 One Oxford Centre</p> <p>8 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219</p> <p>9 BY: FRANK H. STOY, ESQ.</p> <p>10 fhs@pietrogallo.com</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 Attorneys for Defendant - Teva</p> <p>13 Pharmaceuticals USA:</p> <p>14 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP</p> <p>15 333 SE 2nd Avenue</p> <p>16 Miami, Florida 33131</p> <p>17 BY: TIFFANY M. ANDRAS, ESQ.</p> <p>18 andrast@gtlaw.com</p> <p>19</p> <p>20 Counsel for Defendant - ZHP</p> <p>21 SKADDEN ARPS SLATE MEAGHER & FLOM, LLP</p> <p>22 500 Boylston Street</p> <p>23 Boston, Massachusetts 02116</p> <p>24 BY: ZACHARY W. MARTIN, ESQ.</p> <p>25 zachary.martin@skadden.com</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>1 A P P E A R A N C E S, continued:</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 Counsel for Defendant - Express</p> <p>4 Scripts:</p> <p>5 HUSCH BLACKWELL, LLP</p> <p>6 4240 Duncan Avenue</p> <p>7 St. Louis, Missouri 63110</p> <p>8 BY: MATTHEW D. KNEPPER, ESQ.</p> <p>9 matt.knepper@huschblackwell.com</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 ALSO PRESENT:</p> <p>12 JUSTIN BILY, Concierge and Legal Video</p> <p>13 Specialist</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 defendants in this case.</p> <p>3 I'm going to be taking your</p> <p>4 deposition today on behalf of all the</p> <p>5 defendants, although certain of them may</p> <p>6 have additional questions when I'm done</p> <p>7 with mine.</p> <p>8 So thank you for doing this</p> <p>9 today. I really appreciate your time.</p> <p>10 Before we get started, can you</p> <p>11 just state your full name for the record,</p> <p>12 please?</p> <p>13 A. Yes. My name is Laura Craft.</p> <p>14 Q. I know you've been deposed</p> <p>15 quite a few times and you know what</p> <p>16 you're doing but just a few reminders for</p> <p>17 everyone's purposes today.</p> <p>18 I would like verbal answers,</p> <p>19 please, so yes or no and no nodding for</p> <p>20 the court reporter's sake. Is that okay</p> <p>21 with you?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, of course.</p> <p>23 Q. And then also, I'm going to</p> <p>24 try my best not to talk over you -- oh,</p> <p>25 we might have just lost Maureen.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going on</p> <p>3 the record at 8:02 on January 12th,</p> <p>4 2023.</p> <p>5 This is Media Unit 1 of the</p> <p>6 video-recorded deposition of Laura</p> <p>7 Craft regarding the Valsartan</p> <p>8 Litigation.</p> <p>9 My name is Justin Bily</p> <p>10 representing Veritext and I'm the</p> <p>11 videographer. The court reporter is</p> <p>12 Maureen Ratto, from the same firm.</p> <p>13 All counsel will be noted on</p> <p>14 the stenographic record.</p> <p>15 Will the court reporter please</p> <p>16 swear in the witness and we can</p> <p>17 begin.</p> <p>18 * * *</p> <p>19 L A U R A R. C R A F T, having been</p> <p>20 first duly sworn according to law by</p> <p>21 the Officer, testifies as follows:</p> <p>22 EXAMINATION BY MS. BRANCATO:</p> <p>23 Q. Good morning, Ms. Craft. My</p> <p>24 name is Alexia Brancato and I am with</p> <p>25 Kirkland and I represent the Torrent</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 THE REPORTER: I'm here.</p> <p>3 MS. BRANCATO: Okay. Good.</p> <p>4 Just checking.</p> <p>5 Q. Sorry about that. I'm going to</p> <p>6 try not to talk over you and if you could</p> <p>7 try not to talk over me and give Dave a</p> <p>8 chance to object, all, again, for the</p> <p>9 court reporter's sake. Does that sound</p> <p>10 okay?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. And if there is any time that</p> <p>13 you don't understand my questions, please</p> <p>14 let me know.</p> <p>15 A. Okay.</p> <p>16 Q. If you do respond to a</p> <p>17 question I'm going to assume that you</p> <p>18 understood it. Is that fair?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you have any documents with</p> <p>21 you in the room today?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, I do. I have one copy of</p> <p>23 my most recent report in this case</p> <p>24 unmarked but printed out in front of me.</p> <p>25 Q. Perfect. And we'll go ahead</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 10</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 and get that marked in just a minute.</p> <p>3 And I assume no one else is in</p> <p>4 the room with you today; is that right?</p> <p>5 A. That's correct.</p> <p>6 Q. And since we're conducting</p> <p>7 this remotely I'll just ask that you turn</p> <p>8 your phone upsidedown and don't use your</p> <p>9 computer for any other purposes other</p> <p>10 than this deposition. Is that fair?</p> <p>11 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Great. All right.</p> <p>13 Ms. Craft, you've been deposed</p> <p>14 in this case before, right?</p> <p>15 A. Yes, I have.</p> <p>16 Q. And that was in connection</p> <p>17 with the report that you issued on</p> <p>18 November 10, 2021, right?</p> <p>19 A. That's correct.</p> <p>20 Q. Since that last deposition,</p> <p>21 have you been retained in any additional</p> <p>22 litigation matters?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Can you tell me about those?</p> <p>25 A. So first I would direct your</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 12</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 et al versus Caremark, which is a False</p> <p>3 Claims Act case.</p> <p>4 Q. That first case you mentioned,</p> <p>5 I'm sorry, I didn't catch the drug name,</p> <p>6 sounds like Bansantin or something?</p> <p>7 A. The generic name of the drug</p> <p>8 is bosentan, which is spelled</p> <p>9 b-o-s-e-n-t-a-n. It's branded reference</p> <p>10 drug is Tracleer, T-r-a-c-l-e-e-r.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Thank you for that.</p> <p>12 In that case is your report</p> <p>13 related to class certification?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>15 Q. And you haven't sat for a</p> <p>16 deposition in that case yet; is that</p> <p>17 right?</p> <p>18 A. That's right, I have not.</p> <p>19 Q. And the In Re: Lipitor case</p> <p>20 that you mentioned, is your report there</p> <p>21 also related to class certification?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>23 Q. And you have not yet sat for a</p> <p>24 deposition in that case; is that right?</p> <p>25 A. That's correct.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 11</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 attention to my most recent report which</p> <p>3 has an updated list of the cases in which</p> <p>4 I've provided expert testimony. There are</p> <p>5 additional cases since the date of that</p> <p>6 report which, as you just mentioned, was</p> <p>7 October of 2022.</p> <p>8 Would you like me to list</p> <p>9 those for you?</p> <p>10 Q. Yes. Let's start with the</p> <p>11 cases that are new since October 2022,</p> <p>12 please.</p> <p>13 A. Okay. Sure. I have filed a</p> <p>14 report in connection with In Re:</p> <p>15 Tracleer, or I believe it's Bosentan is</p> <p>16 the proper titling of the case, Antitrust</p> <p>17 Litigation; I have filed a report in</p> <p>18 connection with the In Re: Lipitor</p> <p>19 Antitrust Litigation; I filed, as an</p> <p>20 administrative proceeding, a report</p> <p>21 involving the termination of business of</p> <p>22 a number of substance abuse disorder</p> <p>23 clinics in California; I have filed, in</p> <p>24 addition, two reports since that date in</p> <p>25 connection with a case entitled Behnke,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Q. The case or the administrative</p> <p>3 matters you mentioned about the</p> <p>4 terminations related to substance abuse</p> <p>5 clinics, can you tell me what your report</p> <p>6 is -- the subject matter of your report</p> <p>7 for those cases or those administrative</p> <p>8 matters?</p> <p>9 A. It's actually singular. It's</p> <p>10 multiple organizations but one report and</p> <p>11 the question had to do with the market</p> <p>12 for in-patient rehabilitation facilities</p> <p>13 to address substance abuse disorders and</p> <p>14 the economic explanations for why two</p> <p>15 operators of such clinics in Southern</p> <p>16 California ultimately terminated their</p> <p>17 operations following damage in the</p> <p>18 Woolsey fire.</p> <p>19 Q. And in that administrative</p> <p>20 matter who have you been retained by?</p> <p>21 A. The operators of those</p> <p>22 facilities.</p> <p>23 Q. Is it one operator in</p> <p>24 particular or is there multiple</p> <p>25 operators?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 A. There is a joint ownership</p> <p>3 structure. There are two separate</p> <p>4 corporate entities but they have a joint</p> <p>5 ownership.</p> <p>6 Q. And do you expect to be</p> <p>7 deposed in that administrative matter?</p> <p>8 A. I don't believe depositions</p> <p>9 ordinarily are allowed in that particular</p> <p>10 set of proceedings, so the answer would</p> <p>11 be no.</p> <p>12 Q. Do you know if those kinds of</p> <p>13 proceedings ever go to some kind of trial</p> <p>14 or hearing?</p> <p>15 A. Generally not. I don't know</p> <p>16 whether there are circumstances where</p> <p>17 they may, but generally not. That's the</p> <p>18 purpose of the administrative proceeding,</p> <p>19 is to be able to reduce the time and cost</p> <p>20 associated with a resolution.</p> <p>21 Q. And you mentioned two reports</p> <p>22 in Behnke, et al versus Caremark. Can</p> <p>23 you tell me what the subject matter of</p> <p>24 those two reports was?</p> <p>25 A. Yes. The case involves PBM</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Caremark either misreported or caused</p> <p>3 others to misreport.</p> <p>4 Q. As part of your expert report</p> <p>5 in that case -- let me back up.</p> <p>6 You mentioned there were two</p> <p>7 reports in that case; is that right?</p> <p>8 A. That's correct.</p> <p>9 Q. What does each report -- what</p> <p>10 is the subject matter of each report,</p> <p>11 each individual report?</p> <p>12 A. The subject matter is the</p> <p>13 same. This was a schedule in which the</p> <p>14 court ordered simultaneous filings by</p> <p>15 both sides followed by a simultaneous</p> <p>16 filing by both sides again. So the normal</p> <p>17 reply and rebuttal structure wasn't</p> <p>18 present.</p> <p>19 Q. So is the substance exactly</p> <p>20 the same or are there different, slightly</p> <p>21 differences?</p> <p>22 A. The latter report addresses</p> <p>23 the initial reports supplied by</p> <p>24 Caremark's experts. It's -- we were both</p> <p>25 filing at once and then we were both</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 processing and reporting</p> <p>3 responsibilities.</p> <p>4 Q. And was your report focused on</p> <p>5 class certification or another subject</p> <p>6 matter?</p> <p>7 A. That is not a class action.</p> <p>8 Q. And who were you retained by</p> <p>9 in that case?</p> <p>10 A. By the relator, who is the</p> <p>11 plaintiff or counsel -- I'm sorry -- I</p> <p>12 should speak more correctly. By counsel</p> <p>13 for the relator, who is the plaintiff.</p> <p>14 Q. What opinions are you offering</p> <p>15 in that case related to PBM processes and</p> <p>16 reporting responsibilities?</p> <p>17 A. The opinions relate to</p> <p>18 appropriate reporting of drug prices on</p> <p>19 PDE and DIR forms submitted to CMS for</p> <p>20 Medicare Part D plans.</p> <p>21 Q. And is the relator's</p> <p>22 allegation in that case that Caremark, as</p> <p>23 a PBM, did not properly report drug</p> <p>24 prices on those forms submitted to CMS?</p> <p>25 A. Yes. To be more precise, that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 responding to each other's reports, but</p> <p>3 the subject matter is exactly the same.</p> <p>4 Q. And in that case did you reach</p> <p>5 an opinion as to whether Caremark did, in</p> <p>6 fact, itself or cause others to</p> <p>7 inaccurately report drug prices?</p> <p>8 A. I'm going to point out that</p> <p>9 these reports are filed under seal, that</p> <p>10 they are confidential, that I'm not at</p> <p>11 liberty to discuss the contents.</p> <p>12 I can respond insofar as</p> <p>13 saying the answer is yes, but I'm not</p> <p>14 going to provide any further details</p> <p>15 about those reports while they're under</p> <p>16 seal.</p> <p>17 MR. STANOCH: I'll instruct</p> <p>18 the witness not to do so.</p> <p>19 Q. Ms. Craft, I understand your</p> <p>20 confidentiality opinions. I want to ask</p> <p>21 one more question about the opinions</p> <p>22 related to that last one. If you can't</p> <p>23 answer, I understand.</p> <p>24 Did you reach an opinion as to</p> <p>25 why Caremark itself or causing others to</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 inaccurately report drug prices?</p> <p>3 MR. STANOCH: Objection. And,</p> <p>4 again, instruct the witness not to</p> <p>5 divulge any information subject to</p> <p>6 a confidentiality order in a</p> <p>7 different case.</p> <p>8 A. And I would point out, I don't</p> <p>9 think I understand your question,</p> <p>10 Ms. Brancato.</p> <p>11 If you mean by "why", what is</p> <p>12 the motivation for doing so? I don't</p> <p>13 opine on motivations.</p> <p>14 Q. And you haven't yet been</p> <p>15 deposed in the Caremark case; is that</p> <p>16 right?</p> <p>17 A. That is correct.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you expect to be deposed in</p> <p>19 that one?</p> <p>20 A. I imagine I will be.</p> <p>21 Q. And do you know if it's been</p> <p>22 scheduled yet or if there are -- I'm</p> <p>23 sorry. Go ahead.</p> <p>24 A. No date has been set for my</p> <p>25 deposition.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 have you testified at any trials?</p> <p>3 A. No.</p> <p>4 Q. And since your last deposition</p> <p>5 have you been deposed at all?</p> <p>6 A. I honestly don't remember what</p> <p>7 the date of my last deposition was</p> <p>8 vis-à-vis the dates of depositions that</p> <p>9 are listed on my current testimony list.</p> <p>10 I can tell you that of the new</p> <p>11 cases for which I have filed reports</p> <p>12 since my October 2022 report, none of</p> <p>13 those have yet involved depositions.</p> <p>14 As you can see from the CV</p> <p>15 that is attached to -- sorry -- the</p> <p>16 testimony list attached to this October</p> <p>17 2022 report, I have been deposed in Zydus</p> <p>18 and I believe that deposition took place</p> <p>19 after my original deposition in this</p> <p>20 case, but I can't be confident about the</p> <p>21 exact date. And the deposition that I</p> <p>22 gave, as listed on my testimony list in</p> <p>23 Staley versus Gilead Sciences, I don't</p> <p>24 know whether that deposition occurred</p> <p>25 before or after my deposition in this</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Going back now to cases</p> <p>3 that you have been retained for between</p> <p>4 the last deposition you gave in this case</p> <p>5 and today -- we talked about a few that</p> <p>6 have happened since October of 2022.</p> <p>7 If I'm understanding</p> <p>8 correctly, and you can correct me if I'm</p> <p>9 wrong, just trying to compare your two</p> <p>10 CVs, between the first CV attached to</p> <p>11 your October 2022 report and the CV</p> <p>12 attached to your October 2022 report, it</p> <p>13 looks like the only new case is Zydus</p> <p>14 Worldwide DMC versus Teva; is that right?</p> <p>15 A. I only have in front of me a</p> <p>16 copy of my most recent report.</p> <p>17 I will take your word for it</p> <p>18 that Peter Staley versus Gilead Sciences</p> <p>19 from 2021 was disclosed on the earlier of</p> <p>20 my two reports, which would mean that you</p> <p>21 are correct, that Zydus versus Teva is</p> <p>22 the other case that appears on my October</p> <p>23 report but did not appear on my initial</p> <p>24 report in this case.</p> <p>25 Q. Since your last deposition</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 valsartan matter. But I was, as listed on</p> <p>3 the -- as is clear from the testimony</p> <p>4 list, I was deposed in both of those</p> <p>5 cases, Zydus and Gilead.</p> <p>6 Q. Have you written any articles</p> <p>7 or publications since your last</p> <p>8 deposition, which I'll represent to you</p> <p>9 was February 2022?</p> <p>10 A. Okay. Thank you for putting</p> <p>11 that in time for me. The answer is no.</p> <p>12 Q. Ms. Craft, what did you do to</p> <p>13 prepare for your deposition today?</p> <p>14 A. I reviewed the most recent</p> <p>15 report of Tim Kosty; I reviewed the</p> <p>16 report that I had submitted in this</p> <p>17 matter in October of 2022; I had a brief</p> <p>18 conversation yesterday with counsel,</p> <p>19 David Stanoch; I looked back at a few of</p> <p>20 the materials cited in my report, in my</p> <p>21 most recent report, and that's about it.</p> <p>22 Q. Your call yesterday with</p> <p>23 Mr. Stanoch, was anyone else on besides</p> <p>24 the two of you?</p> <p>25 A. No.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Q. When you say you looked back</p> <p>3 at a few of the materials cited in your</p> <p>4 report, in your own recent report, do you</p> <p>5 remember what documents those were or</p> <p>6 what materials those were?</p> <p>7 A. I recall that I looked at a</p> <p>8 number of -- or two depositions from</p> <p>9 SummaCare and EmblemHealth</p> <p>10 representatives. Those are the</p> <p>11 depositions that had previously been</p> <p>12 listed as materials that I relied upon</p> <p>13 but I went back and looked at those and I</p> <p>14 also looked at the data that had</p> <p>15 previously been supplied by plaintiff</p> <p>16 MSP, and I compared it to a more recent</p> <p>17 production of such claims data that I</p> <p>18 believe was made by MSP in roughly mid</p> <p>19 December of 2022.</p> <p>20 Q. When you say you looked at</p> <p>21 data previously supplied by MSP, do you</p> <p>22 know approximately when that was</p> <p>23 provided?</p> <p>24 MR. STANOCH: Objection,</p> <p>25 vague. Do you mean supplied to her?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 I do not know the date on</p> <p>3 which that production was supplied to</p> <p>4 counsel in this case. I do know that I</p> <p>5 received it on December 19 of 2022.</p> <p>6 Q. When you say claims data from</p> <p>7 MSP, do you know if that data comes from</p> <p>8 their PBM or some other data maintained</p> <p>9 by MSP alone?</p> <p>10 A. The data is ultimately sourced</p> <p>11 with the PBM of EmblemHealth and</p> <p>12 SummaCare. The data was supplied by them</p> <p>13 pursuant to their claim assignment to</p> <p>14 MSP.</p> <p>15 So the data is currently, as I</p> <p>16 understand it, in the possession and</p> <p>17 control of MSP and was produced by MSP</p> <p>18 but it is directly traced back to the</p> <p>19 PBMs who performed claims adjudication</p> <p>20 functions contemporaneous with the</p> <p>21 reported purchases having been made on</p> <p>22 both of EmblemHealth and SummaCare.</p> <p>23 Q. EmblemHealth uses Express</p> <p>24 Scripts as their PBM; is that right?</p> <p>25 A. That is my understanding.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Supplied in the litigation?</p> <p>3 Objection, vague.</p> <p>4 Q. So, Ms. Craft, I'm trying to</p> <p>5 understand. You mentioned that you</p> <p>6 looked at claims data that MSP produced</p> <p>7 or that you received in December 2022,</p> <p>8 I'm not sure. So I'm just trying to</p> <p>9 establish what the earlier MSP claims</p> <p>10 data, if there is a date range on that?</p> <p>11 A. The earlier MSP data is the</p> <p>12 data discussed in my October 2022 report.</p> <p>13 In that report I explained how such data</p> <p>14 is collected and what it represents and I</p> <p>15 referenced the data that MSP had</p> <p>16 supplied.</p> <p>17 It is my understanding that</p> <p>18 after the date of my report MSP produced</p> <p>19 this same -- effectively the same claims</p> <p>20 but more detailed fields for those same</p> <p>21 claims and, therefore, provided a fuller</p> <p>22 record for each of the claims that had</p> <p>23 previously been represented in its data</p> <p>24 production but with a more limited set of</p> <p>25 fields supplied.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Q. And SummaCare uses MedImpact</p> <p>3 as their PBM; is that correct?</p> <p>4 A. That's also my understanding,</p> <p>5 MedImpact having been acquired by Express</p> <p>6 Scripts.</p> <p>7 Q. You mention you did a</p> <p>8 comparison between the data referred to</p> <p>9 in your October 2022 report -- 2022</p> <p>10 report and the data that you received in</p> <p>11 December of 2022. And that it looked like</p> <p>12 the December 2022 data had more fields;</p> <p>13 is that right?</p> <p>14 A. That's correct.</p> <p>15 Q. Were there any other</p> <p>16 differences between the two datasets?</p> <p>17 A. No, not that I observed. I</p> <p>18 believe the date ranges were the same and</p> <p>19 the -- and the underlying transactions</p> <p>20 represented were the same. There was</p> <p>21 simply more detail provided about each of</p> <p>22 those transactions.</p> <p>23 Q. And sitting here today, do you</p> <p>24 recall what the additional detail was?</p> <p>25 A. Yes, I do. Would you like me</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 to explain what additional types of</p> <p>3 information were supplied?</p> <p>4 Q. Yes, please.</p> <p>5 A. Okay. And first of all, let me</p> <p>6 make clear that the earlier production</p> <p>7 that we had received also involved a</p> <p>8 third entity, ConnectiCare. The updated</p> <p>9 data pertained to the current plaintiffs</p> <p>10 and what I understand to be a bellwether</p> <p>11 proceeding, EmblemHealth and SummaCare.</p> <p>12 So what I looked at before my</p> <p>13 deposition here was a comparison of the</p> <p>14 prior production and most recent</p> <p>15 production for those Emblem and SummaCare</p> <p>16 claims. And the additional information</p> <p>17 supplied included numerous fields. I</p> <p>18 don't recall precisely, off the top of my</p> <p>19 head, how many fields were in the</p> <p>20 original production, but it was a</p> <p>21 small-ish number, something along the</p> <p>22 order of seven or eight.</p> <p>23 There are now many many more</p> <p>24 fields produced and they include things</p> <p>25 such as dispensing fee and ingredient</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 previously supplied.</p> <p>3 Q. Other than doing this</p> <p>4 comparison between the older data from</p> <p>5 October of 2022 and the newer data from</p> <p>6 December of 2022, did you do anything</p> <p>7 else with the datasets?</p> <p>8 A. I had a health economist in</p> <p>9 our shop format the data so that it was</p> <p>10 easier for me to review and that was how</p> <p>11 I then undertook my review. But, no, it</p> <p>12 was purely for the purpose of examining</p> <p>13 the data to determine how it conformed</p> <p>14 with industry standard practices in terms</p> <p>15 of data supplied by PBMs and whether it</p> <p>16 was possible to, using this data, to</p> <p>17 precisely calculate the amount that had</p> <p>18 been paid by SummaCare and EmblemHealth</p> <p>19 for prescriptions of the specific NDCs,</p> <p>20 so National Drug Code products, that had</p> <p>21 been manufactured by the defendants who</p> <p>22 are subject to the current bellwether</p> <p>23 trial. So, in other words, it was a</p> <p>24 broader set of data originally produced.</p> <p>25 But my understanding of the current</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 cost and a decomposition of the</p> <p>3 consumers' cost share into its three</p> <p>4 potential components, those being the</p> <p>5 deductible, co-pay or co-insurance.</p> <p>6 So those elements are provided</p> <p>7 now specifically so that one can see each</p> <p>8 of the pieces that contribute to the</p> <p>9 overall transaction price.</p> <p>10 Q. And can you recall any other</p> <p>11 fields of information?</p> <p>12 A. There are -- some of the</p> <p>13 fields appear, the same content or same</p> <p>14 value appears in a couple of different</p> <p>15 fields with readily identifiable names</p> <p>16 but they are -- they are slightly</p> <p>17 different names.</p> <p>18 For example, there are</p> <p>19 multiple fields that report the</p> <p>20 ingredient cost for the product. Some of</p> <p>21 the expansion of fields is merely</p> <p>22 reporting the same value in different</p> <p>23 ways, but some of the fields are</p> <p>24 specifically new values that were not</p> <p>25 included in the more summary data</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 bellwether trial is that it is limited to</p> <p>3 products manufactured or supplied by</p> <p>4 three large-name defendants; so Teva,</p> <p>5 Torrent and ZHP. And so the data, when</p> <p>6 it was cleaned, was made available to me</p> <p>7 to review, including only the -- those</p> <p>8 particular NDCs.</p> <p>9 So the data was segmented in</p> <p>10 such a way that it included only product</p> <p>11 that was directly attributable to one of</p> <p>12 the named defendants in this -- in this</p> <p>13 bellwether case, and that the ability to</p> <p>14 do that automatically, simply and</p> <p>15 programmatically is yet another feature</p> <p>16 of the type of data that is supplied,</p> <p>17 recorded and supplied by PBMs in this</p> <p>18 industry.</p> <p>19 You always know precisely what</p> <p>20 product is being sold at the end purchase</p> <p>21 stage and you always know who made it, so</p> <p>22 there was no ambiguity about doing that.</p> <p>23 It's an automatic query.</p> <p>24 I believe a list of the NDCs</p> <p>25 that were used in that process is the</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 very list that's attached as Exhibit D to</p> <p>3 my October 2022 report.</p> <p>4 Q. You mentioned earlier that the</p> <p>5 December 2022 data that you reviewed was</p> <p>6 sourced specifically from EmblemHealth</p> <p>7 and SummaCare and that any data related</p> <p>8 to ConnectiCare was removed; is that</p> <p>9 right?</p> <p>10 MR. STANOCH: Objection. Go</p> <p>11 ahead.</p> <p>12 A. It wasn't removed, no. I'm</p> <p>13 sorry. That's -- that's not correct. It</p> <p>14 wasn't removed.</p> <p>15 It was when I had the data</p> <p>16 just formatted so I could review it I</p> <p>17 asked that it be restricted to the data</p> <p>18 for Emblem and Summa because they are the</p> <p>19 plaintiffs in this -- in this bellwether</p> <p>20 proceeding.</p> <p>21 I believe, although -- yeah, I</p> <p>22 know that ConnectiCare data was still</p> <p>23 included in the December 2022 data, but I</p> <p>24 don't believe it had been updated. Its</p> <p>25 format was basically the same as it had</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 depositions in this case from Emblem and</p> <p>3 Summa, representatives or -- or a MSP</p> <p>4 representative, I don't recall which,</p> <p>5 it's plainly labeled.</p> <p>6 So I imagine he wrote a single</p> <p>7 query that instructed that only those</p> <p>8 where the Emblem and Summa names were</p> <p>9 present would be included in the</p> <p>10 segmented data.</p> <p>11 Q. Let's go ahead and look at</p> <p>12 Exhibit -- tab 1, please, which we'll</p> <p>13 mark as Exhibit 1.</p> <p>14 (Exhibit 1, notice of</p> <p>15 deposition was received and marked</p> <p>16 on this date for identification.)</p> <p>17 Q. Ms. Craft, it's on the screen</p> <p>18 but you should also have the exhibit</p> <p>19 link, if you want it.</p> <p>20 A. So I was supplied with two --</p> <p>21 let me see if I update if it will show</p> <p>22 up. Okay, here we go.</p> <p>23 Q. You see you have the file from</p> <p>24 the share link?</p> <p>25 A. I do.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 been, but the EmblemHealth and SummaCare</p> <p>3 data had specifically been expanded to</p> <p>4 include these additional fields that I've</p> <p>5 just described.</p> <p>6 Q. You mentioned that you asked</p> <p>7 that the data be restricted to Emblem and</p> <p>8 Summa because these are the plaintiffs</p> <p>9 proceeding in this trial.</p> <p>10 Who actually did the</p> <p>11 restricting?</p> <p>12 A. A healthcare economist in my</p> <p>13 shop whose named Kevin Chu.</p> <p>14 Q. Do you know how he went about</p> <p>15 doing the actual restricting?</p> <p>16 A. I believe it was a simple</p> <p>17 query by the payor name which appears in</p> <p>18 two different fields in the data.</p> <p>19 So EmblemHealth is there as an</p> <p>20 acronym in one of the fields, and it</p> <p>21 appears also in a second field. I don't</p> <p>22 know which of the two fields he used to</p> <p>23 identify Emblem and Summa transactions</p> <p>24 but he could have used either one.</p> <p>25 As explained in the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Great. So Exhibit 1 is</p> <p>3 the notice of videotape deposition of</p> <p>4 Laura Craft. Do you see that?</p> <p>5 A. I do.</p> <p>6 Q. And Ms. Craft, have you seen</p> <p>7 this document before?</p> <p>8 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>9 Q. If we go to page 5 of the pdf</p> <p>10 do you see that on page 5 and the</p> <p>11 following pages there are some requests?</p> <p>12 A. I see those pages. What is</p> <p>13 your question about them?</p> <p>14 Q. Did you personally review</p> <p>15 these requests?</p> <p>16 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>17 form.</p> <p>18 A. I don't recall whether I</p> <p>19 personally reviewed them.</p> <p>20 Q. And were you personally</p> <p>21 involved in making sure that documents</p> <p>22 responsive to these requests were</p> <p>23 produced?</p> <p>24 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>25 form, misstates the record.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Clearly objections and</p> <p>3 response is timely served by</p> <p>4 plaintiffs. But go ahead if you can</p> <p>5 answer, Ms. Craft.</p> <p>6 A. I believe your request or your</p> <p>7 question had to do with whether I was</p> <p>8 personally responsible for seeing to it</p> <p>9 that the items described here were</p> <p>10 supplied. I believe you've previously</p> <p>11 been supplied with the content described</p> <p>12 here.</p> <p>13 We can go through these items</p> <p>14 one at a time if you would like to do so.</p> <p>15 Q. Let me do this another way.</p> <p>16 Earlier this week your counsel</p> <p>17 produced to us several, a few documents.</p> <p>18 Were you involved in collecting those</p> <p>19 documents to be produced?</p> <p>20 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>21 form.</p> <p>22 A. You would have to tell me what</p> <p>23 they were for me to know whether I was</p> <p>24 involved. I have no idea what production</p> <p>25 you may be referring to.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 31st, 2022?</p> <p>3 A. Once again, if you'll just</p> <p>4 give me a moment, I will scroll through</p> <p>5 it and just check that it is.</p> <p>6 Q. Sure.</p> <p>7 A. Yes. I recognize that as my</p> <p>8 most recent report.</p> <p>9 Q. Great. You can feel free to</p> <p>10 use the electronic version if you want or</p> <p>11 the paper version in front of you,</p> <p>12 whichever you prefer, as we go through</p> <p>13 today.</p> <p>14 A. Thank you.</p> <p>15 Q. Ms. Craft, do you know</p> <p>16 approximately when you started working on</p> <p>17 the report in Exhibit 3?</p> <p>18 A. I really don't recall. It</p> <p>19 obviously would have been in advance of</p> <p>20 the October 31 filing date. I would be</p> <p>21 speculating about how much in advance of</p> <p>22 that date I started work on it.</p> <p>23 Q. Let's look at Exhibit E to</p> <p>24 Exhibit 3.</p> <p>25 A. I see that.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Q. Let's look at tab 2, please.</p> <p>3 We're just going to get this marked for</p> <p>4 the record as Exhibit 2.</p> <p>5 (Exhibit 2, Expert report of</p> <p>6 Laura Craft dated November 10, 2021</p> <p>7 was received and marked on this</p> <p>8 date for identification.)</p> <p>9 Q. Exhibit 2 Ms. Craft, do you</p> <p>10 see Exhibit 2?</p> <p>11 A. I do.</p> <p>12 Q. Is this a copy of the report</p> <p>13 that you issued on November 10th of 2021?</p> <p>14 A. Let me just take a second and</p> <p>15 scroll through it before I answer that.</p> <p>16 Yes, it does appear to be that</p> <p>17 report.</p> <p>18 Q. And if we can please look at</p> <p>19 tab 3, which we'll mark as Exhibit 3.</p> <p>20 (Exhibit 3, expert report of</p> <p>21 Laura Craft dated October 31, 2022</p> <p>22 was received and marked on this</p> <p>23 date for identification.)</p> <p>24 Q. Ms. Craft, does Exhibit 3</p> <p>25 appear to be your report issued October</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Q. This is the materials relied</p> <p>3 upon list for this report, correct?</p> <p>4 A. That's right.</p> <p>5 Q. And you also mention in your</p> <p>6 report that you're also incorporating the</p> <p>7 materials relied upon in your previous</p> <p>8 report from November 2021; is that right?</p> <p>9 A. That's correct.</p> <p>10 Q. This materials relied upon</p> <p>11 list in Exhibit E of Exhibit 3 starts</p> <p>12 with a FDA announcement about recalls; is</p> <p>13 that right?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. And in the Bates numbered</p> <p>16 documents are all, correct me if I'm</p> <p>17 wrong, contracts with MSP or I should say</p> <p>18 contracts between MSP's assignors and --</p> <p>19 strike that. We'll do this later, to be</p> <p>20 precise.</p> <p>21 Are there any materials that</p> <p>22 are not listed here that you considered</p> <p>23 in forming your opinions?</p> <p>24 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>25 form. And you just referenced her</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 to her report, but discussed about</p> <p>3 other things, but go ahead.</p> <p>4 A. I don't agree with the</p> <p>5 characterization that these are all</p> <p>6 contracts with MSP, but if your question</p> <p>7 is, did I rely on materials listed --</p> <p>8 that are not listed here, and not listed</p> <p>9 on the materials relied upon in my</p> <p>10 initial report, I'm not aware of any.</p> <p>11 It certainly was my intention</p> <p>12 to list everything and I hope I have not</p> <p>13 failed to do so.</p> <p>14 Q. Other than the December 2022</p> <p>15 MSP data and the report of Mr. Kosty that</p> <p>16 were recently provided to you, is there</p> <p>17 anything else that you reviewed that's</p> <p>18 not listed on this list for purpose of</p> <p>19 today?</p> <p>20 MR. STANOCH: And objection to</p> <p>21 form. We served objections and</p> <p>22 responses to the deposition notice</p> <p>23 which identified additional</p> <p>24 materials since the October 2022</p> <p>25 report. But go ahead, Ms. Craft.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 (Exhibit 4, OnPoint Analytics</p> <p>3 invoices dated January 1, 2022 to</p> <p>4 October 31st, 2022 was received and</p> <p>5 marked on this date for</p> <p>6 identification.)</p> <p>7 Q. Ms. Craft, just let me know</p> <p>8 when you have that open.</p> <p>9 A. Thank you. Okay. I have it</p> <p>10 open.</p> <p>11 Q. Ms. Craft, do you recognize</p> <p>12 these as invoices issued by your firm</p> <p>13 covering January 1, 2022 to October 31st,</p> <p>14 2022?</p> <p>15 A. That's what they appear to be.</p> <p>16 Q. And do you know if your firm</p> <p>17 has sent any additional invoices to</p> <p>18 plaintiff's counsel since October 31st,</p> <p>19 2022?</p> <p>20 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>21 form. The first page is dated</p> <p>22 December 13th, 2022.</p> <p>23 MS. BRANCATO: Let me</p> <p>24 rephrase.</p> <p>25 Q. Are you aware of whether your</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 A. Well, I think your question is</p> <p>3 one I've previously answered, unless I am</p> <p>4 misunderstanding it, which is the</p> <p>5 additional materials that I considered</p> <p>6 after the date of my October 31, 2022</p> <p>7 report and in connection with preparing</p> <p>8 my -- for my deposition today included</p> <p>9 the new MSP production of its claims data</p> <p>10 as well as Mr. Kosty's most recent</p> <p>11 report. And as I said earlier this</p> <p>12 morning, those are the only additional</p> <p>13 materials that I reviewed in connection</p> <p>14 with preparing for this deposition.</p> <p>15 Q. Since you finalized your</p> <p>16 report in November 2022 are there any</p> <p>17 changes that you want to make to it at</p> <p>18 this point?</p> <p>19 A. No.</p> <p>20 Q. Reviewing Mr. Kosty's report</p> <p>21 did not change any of your opinions; is</p> <p>22 that right?</p> <p>23 A. That's correct.</p> <p>24 Q. Let's look at tab 4, please,</p> <p>25 which we'll mark as Exhibit 4.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 firm issued any other additional invoices</p> <p>3 to plaintiff's counsel covering a time</p> <p>4 after October 31st, 2022?</p> <p>5 A. No, I'm not.</p> <p>6 Q. Other than the time you spent</p> <p>7 preparing for this deposition today, have</p> <p>8 you incurred any other time related to</p> <p>9 this matter since October 31st, 2022?</p> <p>10 A. No.</p> <p>11 Q. On the first page of Exhibit 4</p> <p>12 toward the bottom there is an entry for</p> <p>13 September 23rd, 2022 LRC emails with new</p> <p>14 counsel re: New report. Do you see that?</p> <p>15 A. I do.</p> <p>16 Q. Is this approximately the time</p> <p>17 when you started working on the October</p> <p>18 31st report?</p> <p>19 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>20 form. Go ahead.</p> <p>21 A. It appears to be the time when</p> <p>22 I had an email with the counsel about it.</p> <p>23 I don't know that that's when I actually</p> <p>24 started work.</p> <p>25 The actual first substantive</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 entry appears to be October 4, where I'm</p> <p>3 reviewing something that's been supplied</p> <p>4 by counsel, so in that vicinity. I don't</p> <p>5 know how precise we need to be about the</p> <p>6 date but clearly on September 23rd of</p> <p>7 2022 I became aware there would be a new</p> <p>8 report.</p> <p>9 Q. If you look at the second</p> <p>10 page, please, there are a number of</p> <p>11 entries on this page, starting with</p> <p>12 October 24th, 2022. For KC where it</p> <p>13 says, "Clean MSP and Xponent data,</p> <p>14 extract relevant statistics, create</p> <p>15 tables." Do you see that?</p> <p>16 A. I do.</p> <p>17 Q. And similar entries appear on</p> <p>18 October 26th, October 27th and 28th. Do</p> <p>19 you see those?</p> <p>20 A. I do.</p> <p>21 Q. What was the purpose of that</p> <p>22 analysis?</p> <p>23 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>24 form and just caution the witness</p> <p>25 not to reveal any attorney work</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>3 form. Go ahead.</p> <p>4 A. Yes, it was. Although, I knew</p> <p>5 there had to be additional fields to</p> <p>6 supplement what MSP had been produced and</p> <p>7 I believe we now see those in the data</p> <p>8 that I received on December 19 of 2022.</p> <p>9 Q. Are you aware whether there</p> <p>10 are still more fields that could be</p> <p>11 produced by MSP, more than what you saw</p> <p>12 in the production from December 19th,</p> <p>13 2022?</p> <p>14 A. Well, when you say are there</p> <p>15 more fields, the -- of course, there were</p> <p>16 more fields at the time the claim was</p> <p>17 adjudicated by the PBM. PBM data can</p> <p>18 consist of anywhere from, say, 60 to 90</p> <p>19 different fields, most of which are</p> <p>20 irrelevant and get -- to this particular</p> <p>21 case and get used only for very specific</p> <p>22 kinds of entries.</p> <p>23 So there may, for example, be</p> <p>24 controlled substance codes, where the</p> <p>25 drug is one that is subject to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 product or any attorney</p> <p>3 communications.</p> <p>4 A. I wanted to see what data MSP</p> <p>5 had produced to determine whether it was</p> <p>6 consistent with my understanding about</p> <p>7 the type of data that is generated</p> <p>8 simultaneously with every prescription</p> <p>9 dispensing event and to see whether it</p> <p>10 contained the industry standard fields</p> <p>11 that are used to record and track how</p> <p>12 much is paid for every prescription for</p> <p>13 each NDC code and to allocate that price</p> <p>14 between the third-party payor.</p> <p>15 So I was interested in</p> <p>16 reviewing that data for the purpose of</p> <p>17 understanding whether it was consistent</p> <p>18 with my knowledge about how the industry</p> <p>19 operates and the types of data that are</p> <p>20 invariably generated and retained.</p> <p>21 Q. And was your conclusion from</p> <p>22 that review that the MSP data was</p> <p>23 consistent with how the industry operates</p> <p>24 and the type of data that are invariably</p> <p>25 generated and retained?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 distribution controls. There may be</p> <p>3 specific fields for injectable drugs,</p> <p>4 things of that sort. So there are many</p> <p>5 many fields and PBM data.</p> <p>6 It is not always the case that</p> <p>7 payors such as EmblemHealth and SummaCare</p> <p>8 need or want all of those fields. What</p> <p>9 they are interested in are the fields</p> <p>10 that identify the transaction specifics</p> <p>11 for each purchase by their members of a</p> <p>12 prescription drug. So they want to know</p> <p>13 where the transaction occurred, they want</p> <p>14 to know when the transaction occurred,</p> <p>15 they want to know what the pharmacy was,</p> <p>16 they want to know how much was paid and</p> <p>17 they want to know how that cost was</p> <p>18 allocated, they want to know the quantity</p> <p>19 dispensed.</p> <p>20 So those are the basic fields</p> <p>21 that you would expect that an</p> <p>22 EmblemHealth or SummaCare would likely</p> <p>23 have in its data and I think we have</p> <p>24 the -- all of the elements now present in</p> <p>25 the later MSP production that would be</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 relevant to determining damages in this</p> <p>3 case.</p> <p>4 Whether there are additional</p> <p>5 fields not relevant to the determination</p> <p>6 of damages that Summa or Emblem might</p> <p>7 have, I simply would be speculating to</p> <p>8 say that. I am certain there are</p> <p>9 additional fields that PBMs have because</p> <p>10 there always are but once again, they are</p> <p>11 not fields that I would consider to be</p> <p>12 relevant to the determination of damages.</p> <p>13 Q. I just want to make sure I</p> <p>14 understand. Your opinion is that we do</p> <p>15 have with the December 2022 production</p> <p>16 from MSP all of the data fields we need</p> <p>17 to come up with a damages calculation; is</p> <p>18 that right?</p> <p>19 MR. STANOCH: Objection but go</p> <p>20 ahead.</p> <p>21 A. Yes. For the claims that are</p> <p>22 involved in this bellwether case.</p> <p>23 Q. You mentioned that PBMs may</p> <p>24 have, in your experience, somewhere</p> <p>25 between 60 and 90 fields in their claims</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Q. Let's go back to Exhibit 4,</p> <p>3 please, which are your invoices, and I'm</p> <p>4 still on page 2 and we were looking at</p> <p>5 the entries related to cleaning MSP and</p> <p>6 Xponent data and extracting relevant</p> <p>7 statistic and creating tables.</p> <p>8 What relevant statistics were</p> <p>9 extracted from the MSP and Xponent data?</p> <p>10 A. I don't recall but I am</p> <p>11 certain it would have included date</p> <p>12 ranges, identification of fields,</p> <p>13 probably a matching to the NDCs that were</p> <p>14 part of the case at that point. I don't</p> <p>15 recall beyond that.</p> <p>16 Q. Did you rely on those</p> <p>17 statistics in putting together your</p> <p>18 expert report from -- strike that.</p> <p>19 Are you relying on those --</p> <p>20 strike that.</p> <p>21 Did you rely on those</p> <p>22 statistics in putting together your</p> <p>23 October 31st expert report?</p> <p>24 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>25 form.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 data; is that right?</p> <p>3 A. In their processing data. The</p> <p>4 term "claims data" is used somewhat</p> <p>5 loosely and it may mean data that does</p> <p>6 not include all of those fields because</p> <p>7 the especially preserved record that is</p> <p>8 audible and shared with the TPP may not</p> <p>9 include every one of those fields but I</p> <p>10 am aware that the data structure and</p> <p>11 processing capabilities involve 60 to 90</p> <p>12 or so different fields.</p> <p>13 Q. So different PBMs may have a</p> <p>14 different number of fields in their</p> <p>15 processing data; is that right?</p> <p>16 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>17 form.</p> <p>18 A. Not that would be relevant to</p> <p>19 this case but, yes, they may choose to</p> <p>20 add fields that are not essential for the</p> <p>21 operations but that have some value to</p> <p>22 them or that have no relevance to this</p> <p>23 particular drug or set of claims. PBMs</p> <p>24 are free to supplement their data in</p> <p>25 whatever way they choose.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 A. I don't think I relied on any</p> <p>3 statistics. I relied upon what the</p> <p>4 statistics revealed about the coverage of</p> <p>5 the data that MSP had supplied, i.e.,</p> <p>6 that it reported in any usable form the</p> <p>7 transactions by Emblem and SummaCare in</p> <p>8 which they had paid for the products that</p> <p>9 are the subject of this litigation and at</p> <p>10 the time of that October 22 report, of</p> <p>11 course the scope was broader, we weren't</p> <p>12 talking about a narrower universe of</p> <p>13 bellwether claims involving a smaller</p> <p>14 universe of products, but I certainly</p> <p>15 relied upon that kind of information to</p> <p>16 know the time period over which the</p> <p>17 claims data had been supplied, the</p> <p>18 products to which the claims data</p> <p>19 related, what fields had been supplied</p> <p>20 for the claims data and how frequently</p> <p>21 they were populated. This would be pretty</p> <p>22 much standard procedure to effectively</p> <p>23 inventory the data to have a good</p> <p>24 understanding of what it included.</p> <p>25 Q. I want to make sure I</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 50</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 understand this correctly.</p> <p>3 You relied upon the</p> <p>4 conclusions of the statistics in forming</p> <p>5 the opinions of your report; is that</p> <p>6 right?</p> <p>7 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>8 form, misstates the testimony.</p> <p>9 A. I think what I just said was</p> <p>10 that I didn't rely on the statistics,</p> <p>11 themselves, but that was one way of just</p> <p>12 capturing the information that I've</p> <p>13 described to you.</p> <p>14 I don't want to put excessive</p> <p>15 weight on the statistics here. It is, as</p> <p>16 I mentioned, standard procedure when you</p> <p>17 are reviewing data to understand its</p> <p>18 scope and coverage that you tabulate.</p> <p>19 You might prefer the word tabulate. That</p> <p>20 you just look at summaries of number of</p> <p>21 transactions, number of fields, earliest</p> <p>22 date end date. I did not directly rely</p> <p>23 upon any of those numbers in providing my</p> <p>24 October of 2022 report. They did inform</p> <p>25 just my general understanding of the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 52</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 have described as just general workflow,</p> <p>3 work procedure in looking at data.</p> <p>4 Q. And did you rely on these</p> <p>5 tables in putting together the opinions</p> <p>6 in your October 2022 report?</p> <p>7 MR. STANOCH: Objection to the</p> <p>8 form.</p> <p>9 A. I'm afraid I have to give you</p> <p>10 the same answer that I did a moment ago.</p> <p>11 Not the tables, per se. These tables</p> <p>12 would have been created by the economist</p> <p>13 who was doing the data processing to</p> <p>14 provide a sense of the coverage of the</p> <p>15 data, which I describe in my report as</p> <p>16 having come from the PBMs that processed</p> <p>17 claims. This is -- this is nothing but an</p> <p>18 intermediate step between looking at the</p> <p>19 raw data and reaching a conclusion about</p> <p>20 the coverage of the data and its adequacy</p> <p>21 to support a damage calculation. There is</p> <p>22 nothing magic about these tables. They</p> <p>23 are a mechanical effort to summarize</p> <p>24 what's present in the data. That's all.</p> <p>25 Q. Do you recall reviewing the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 51</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 scope and adequacy of the data.</p> <p>3 This is a more efficient way</p> <p>4 of doing this than having me review all</p> <p>5 of the data myself, is to have a skilled</p> <p>6 analyst look at the data and summarize</p> <p>7 what's there.</p> <p>8 Q. There is also a notation in</p> <p>9 these bills for "create tables". Do you</p> <p>10 see that?</p> <p>11 A. I'm sorry. Your microphone</p> <p>12 didn't quite catch that.</p> <p>13 Q. Sure. I'm looking at the entry</p> <p>14 for "create tables". Which appears a few</p> <p>15 times on page 2. Do you see that?</p> <p>16 A. I do see what you've</p> <p>17 highlighted there. Thank you.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you know -- I'm sorry. Go</p> <p>19 ahead.</p> <p>20 A. No. I was just going to say</p> <p>21 what is the question?</p> <p>22 Q. Do you know what tables were</p> <p>23 created based on these entries?</p> <p>24 A. I don't have any specific</p> <p>25 recall. It's the process that I would</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 53</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 tables in putting together your report?</p> <p>3 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>4 form.</p> <p>5 A. No, I don't.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. We can take Exhibit 4</p> <p>7 down.</p> <p>8 Ms. Craft, earlier we were</p> <p>9 talking about EmblemHealth, SummaCare and</p> <p>10 ConnectiCare. Do you recall that?</p> <p>11 A. I recall all three had been</p> <p>12 mentioned. We talked more about Emblem</p> <p>13 and Summa, but I do remember mentioning</p> <p>14 ConnectiCare.</p> <p>15 Q. What is your understanding of</p> <p>16 the relationship between ConnectiCare and</p> <p>17 EmblemHealth?</p> <p>18 A. Between Medicare and the</p> <p>19 EmblemHealth?</p> <p>20 Q. No. Between ConnectiCare and</p> <p>21 EmblemHealth?</p> <p>22 A. Oh, okay. Sorry. I believe</p> <p>23 that ConnectiCare is an affiliate of</p> <p>24 EmblemHealth that operates in</p> <p>25 Connecticut, a separate entity, but it</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 54</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 has some sort of affiliation and I don't</p> <p>3 know what exactly the corporate structure</p> <p>4 is for that affiliation.</p> <p>5 Q. Are you aware of how the PBMs</p> <p>6 differentiate data between ConnectiCare</p> <p>7 and EmblemHealth?</p> <p>8 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>9 form.</p> <p>10 A. I'm sorry. Your question was</p> <p>11 how they differentiate?</p> <p>12 Q. Do you know what PBM</p> <p>13 ConnectiCare uses?</p> <p>14 A. I do not.</p> <p>15 Q. You don't know if it's the</p> <p>16 same PBM as EmblemHealth?</p> <p>17 A. I do not. I do want to just</p> <p>18 expand my answer slightly.</p> <p>19 When you asked -- I was a bit</p> <p>20 thrown when you asked how they</p> <p>21 differentiate. PBMs always differentiate</p> <p>22 their payor clients. And as you can see</p> <p>23 in the data that was previously produced</p> <p>24 by MSP, ConnectiCare claims are facially</p> <p>25 completely distinct from EmblemHealth,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 56</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 affiliates and I said I don't know the</p> <p>3 exact corporate structure of that</p> <p>4 relationship.</p> <p>5 Q. But it's your opinion that,</p> <p>6 regardless of the corporate structure</p> <p>7 that may exist between EmblemHealth and</p> <p>8 ConnectiCare, you can clearly separate</p> <p>9 out claims data between the two; is that</p> <p>10 right?</p> <p>11 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>12 form.</p> <p>13 A. Absolutely. Insurance</p> <p>14 companies, just because they may have</p> <p>15 parents or subsidiaries, don't cease to</p> <p>16 be separate entities and for the purpose</p> <p>17 of tracking business in this highly</p> <p>18 regulated industry they maintain their</p> <p>19 separate identities.</p> <p>20 Insurance companies must</p> <p>21 report to State regulators in which they</p> <p>22 operate, they must report to the National</p> <p>23 Association of Insurance Commissioners.</p> <p>24 There is a parent-child numbering</p> <p>25 convention used in reporting to the NAIC</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 55</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 they -- and that distinction appears in</p> <p>3 the fields that were supplied.</p> <p>4 So a plan sponsor must be</p> <p>5 tracked separately and the -- as I'm sure</p> <p>6 you know -- plan sponsors may -- are</p> <p>7 required to contract with Medicare and</p> <p>8 under those contracts are also separately</p> <p>9 identified.</p> <p>10 Q. Are you aware that the parent</p> <p>11 company of ConnectiCare is EmblemHealth?</p> <p>12 A. I'm sorry. I'm just having a</p> <p>13 little bit of trouble with hearing.</p> <p>14 That the current company of</p> <p>15 EmblemHealth -- sorry, of ConnectiCare --</p> <p>16 repeat your question or read it back if</p> <p>17 you would, please.</p> <p>18 Q. Of course. Are you aware that</p> <p>19 the parent company of ConnectiCare is</p> <p>20 EmblemHealth?</p> <p>21 A. As I said a moment ago, I'm</p> <p>22 aware that they're affiliated</p> <p>23 corporations. Whether it's a direct</p> <p>24 parent relationship or not, I told you I</p> <p>25 don't know. I knew they were corporate</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 57</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 that takes the individual insurers and</p> <p>3 rolls them up to a parent level using</p> <p>4 different numbering systems.</p> <p>5 The fact of a subsidiary</p> <p>6 relationship does not obliterate the</p> <p>7 corporate separateness or individual</p> <p>8 reporting responsibilities of any</p> <p>9 insurance company.</p> <p>10 Q. I just want to make sure I</p> <p>11 understand. I'm talking about PBM data</p> <p>12 specifically and what the PBMs do on</p> <p>13 their side.</p> <p>14 Your opinion is that the PBM</p> <p>15 claims data for ConnectiCare and</p> <p>16 EmblemHealth are separate and clearly</p> <p>17 distinctive; is that right?</p> <p>18 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>19 form.</p> <p>20 A. Clearly distinguishable, yes.</p> <p>21 When you say separate, they may also be</p> <p>22 linked by a client ID number or something</p> <p>23 of the sort, but they are clearly</p> <p>24 distinguishable.</p> <p>25 Q. And they are clearly</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 distinguishable by a field or maybe two</p> <p>3 fields in the PBM data; is that right?</p> <p>4 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>5 form.</p> <p>6 A. I note that they were</p> <p>7 distinguished in the data that was</p> <p>8 produced by MSP through the use of two</p> <p>9 separate fields, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And is there any way in your</p> <p>11 experience to verify that the data for</p> <p>12 EmblemCare is truly just for Emblem care</p> <p>13 and doesn't include any ConnectiCare</p> <p>14 data?</p> <p>15 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>16 form.</p> <p>17 A. I suppose one could audit</p> <p>18 those claim records, including member IDs</p> <p>19 and assure that, for example, the member</p> <p>20 was a member of an Emblem versus</p> <p>21 ConnectiCare claim, but I've not come</p> <p>22 across that problem ever because the</p> <p>23 nature of the legally required reporting</p> <p>24 in this industry would -- would not</p> <p>25 permit or allow separate entities to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Q. Let's look again at Exhibit 3,</p> <p>3 which is your report, your October 2022</p> <p>4 report, to be clear.</p> <p>5 Can we look at paragraph 3?</p> <p>6 Does this paragraph accurately summarize</p> <p>7 your assignment for this particular</p> <p>8 report?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. If we look at paragraph 1 of</p> <p>11 Exhibit 3, there is a clause that starts</p> <p>12 "alleged to have been contaminated." Do</p> <p>13 you see that?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. I just want to double check.</p> <p>16 You're not offering any opinions about</p> <p>17 the truth of any allegations related to</p> <p>18 contamination, correct?</p> <p>19 A. That's correct.</p> <p>20 Q. And one more question on the</p> <p>21 assignment in paragraph 3. Are there any</p> <p>22 edits or changes that you have to that</p> <p>23 assignment paragraph?</p> <p>24 A. No. That was the scope of</p> <p>25 assignment for the October report.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 simply report as their own claims data</p> <p>3 that wasn't for their members. You have</p> <p>4 to be able to track, and indeed in</p> <p>5 Medicare Part D one must be able to track</p> <p>6 using PBM data the experience, the</p> <p>7 precise individual experience of the</p> <p>8 specific plan for its enrolled members.</p> <p>9 So it's antithetical to that reporting</p> <p>10 responsibility that one would commingle</p> <p>11 claims.</p> <p>12 Q. And you have never audited the</p> <p>13 claim records for any PBM; is that right?</p> <p>14 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>15 form.</p> <p>16 A. I've never performed an audit</p> <p>17 of PBM records, that is true.</p> <p>18 Q. Have you ever performed an</p> <p>19 audit of TPP records like those from</p> <p>20 Emblem or SummaCare?</p> <p>21 A. Not that I would describe as</p> <p>22 an audit. I am not an auditor, I have</p> <p>23 examined hundreds and hundreds sets of</p> <p>24 such records but not for the purpose of</p> <p>25 performing an audit.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Q. Paragraphs 2 and 3 of your</p> <p>3 report talk about Exhibit D to the</p> <p>4 report. Do you see that?</p> <p>5 A. Yes, I see now the reference</p> <p>6 to Exhibit D, yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Am I right in understanding</p> <p>8 that Exhibit D is a list of NDC codes for</p> <p>9 valsartan-containing drugs manufactured</p> <p>10 by Teva, Torrent or ZHP for which</p> <p>11 EmblemHealth or SummaCare made payments</p> <p>12 on behalf of their members?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Let's look at Exhibit D to</p> <p>15 your report, it's toward the back. Thank</p> <p>16 you.</p> <p>17 A. If you don't mind, I'm going</p> <p>18 to slightly modify -- there may be a</p> <p>19 slight correction, because the phrase</p> <p>20 that you just read was "NDCs for which</p> <p>21 Emblem and SummaCare members made</p> <p>22 purchases."</p> <p>23 These are -- what Exhibit D</p> <p>24 represents, to be clear, is defendant's</p> <p>25 valsartan-containing drugs, so the</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 bellwether defendants. These are the NDCs</p> <p>3 that they marketed during the relevant</p> <p>4 period that are alleged to have been</p> <p>5 contaminated.</p> <p>6 I can't, as I sit here, verify</p> <p>7 for you that each one of these NDCs was</p> <p>8 purchased at least once by an Emblem</p> <p>9 member and SummaCare member. There may be</p> <p>10 some of these NDCs that did not end up</p> <p>11 being purchased.</p> <p>12 As I mentioned earlier this</p> <p>13 morning, a simple matching of the final</p> <p>14 column of Exhibit D, the NDC list, to the</p> <p>15 data provided by MSP representing</p> <p>16 SummaCare and EmblemHealth transactions,</p> <p>17 identifies the purchases that were for</p> <p>18 drugs listed on Exhibit D. But once</p> <p>19 again, I can't assure you that every one</p> <p>20 of these NDCs was purchased. I can merely</p> <p>21 tell you that it is a trivial action to</p> <p>22 compile a list of all the purchases</p> <p>23 reported by MSP that are for drugs on</p> <p>24 Exhibit D.</p> <p>25 Q. I see. And I appreciate that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 A. I could not go through and</p> <p>3 highlight this exhibit for you with a</p> <p>4 "yes" or "no" right now, but that's --</p> <p>5 that's facially apparent from the data</p> <p>6 that MSP has produced. Because for every</p> <p>7 purchase the NDC field is populated, as</p> <p>8 it must be.</p> <p>9 Q. Did you put Exhibit D</p> <p>10 together?</p> <p>11 A. Did I personally put it</p> <p>12 together? No, I did not.</p> <p>13 Q. Did someone at your firm put</p> <p>14 it together?</p> <p>15 A. We were supplied with the</p> <p>16 original NDC list, which was much</p> <p>17 broader. It was attached, I believe, to</p> <p>18 my original report in this case.</p> <p>19 We then reviewed the original</p> <p>20 list to determine which of those products</p> <p>21 were listed as having one of these three</p> <p>22 entities, it's really more than three</p> <p>23 entities, but affiliations, Teva, Torrent</p> <p>24 and ZHP. And I believe we confirmed the</p> <p>25 list that you see here as Exhibit D here</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 clarification. So Exhibit D are NDCs that</p> <p>3 Teva, Torrent or ZHP marketed during the</p> <p>4 relevant period that are alleged to be</p> <p>5 contaminated; is that right?</p> <p>6 A. Yes. They may not have been</p> <p>7 the direct marketer. So, for example, you</p> <p>8 see a manufacturer name for ZHP that may</p> <p>9 be Solco or AS Medication. In other</p> <p>10 words, ZHP may not, itself, have been the</p> <p>11 marketer.</p> <p>12 Q. I understand. So these are</p> <p>13 NDCs that Teva, Torrent or ZHP</p> <p>14 manufactured during the relevant time</p> <p>15 period that are alleged to have been</p> <p>16 contaminated; is that right?</p> <p>17 A. That's correct.</p> <p>18 Q. And sitting here today, you</p> <p>19 don't know which of these NDCs MSP may</p> <p>20 have paid for -- strike that.</p> <p>21 You don't know which of these</p> <p>22 NDCs MSP may have covered payments for</p> <p>23 its beneficiaries; is that right?</p> <p>24 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>25 form. Go ahead.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 with counsel prior to attaching it to my</p> <p>3 October 2022 report. And I don't remember</p> <p>4 whether an initial list was provided to</p> <p>5 us by counsel or we compiled our own</p> <p>6 initial list, but it basically is just a</p> <p>7 selection from the original NDC list</p> <p>8 attached to my original report to</p> <p>9 identify those products for which -- oh,</p> <p>10 and I see the -- yeah, that original</p> <p>11 list, by the way, also appears as Exhibit</p> <p>12 C to my October '22 report.</p> <p>13 Q. And that was going to be my</p> <p>14 next question. So Exhibit C is the</p> <p>15 original list of NDCs; is that right?</p> <p>16 A. That's right.</p> <p>17 Q. And you don't recall whether</p> <p>18 this list was provided to you by counsel</p> <p>19 or whether your firm generated it; is</p> <p>20 that right?</p> <p>21 A. Your question pertains to</p> <p>22 Exhibit C?</p> <p>23 Q. Correct.</p> <p>24 A. I believe Exhibit C was</p> <p>25 provided to us by counsel and I believe</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 my earlier report says that.</p> <p>3 Q. Ms. Craft, you are not</p> <p>4 offering any opinion about the quality of</p> <p>5 the valsartan-containing drugs listed in</p> <p>6 your Exhibit B, correct?</p> <p>7 A. Well, I'm not expressing any</p> <p>8 opinion about their contamination or the</p> <p>9 level of any such contamination, but in</p> <p>10 response to Mr. Kosty's report, which I</p> <p>11 have, as I said, now reviewed, I can</p> <p>12 assure you that if the contamination</p> <p>13 alleged existed, then the quality, as</p> <p>14 you've just described it in your</p> <p>15 question, of those products was</p> <p>16 unacceptable and they would have had --</p> <p>17 they would not have been allowed to be</p> <p>18 marketed.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you plan on offering that</p> <p>20 opinion at trial?</p> <p>21 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>22 form.</p> <p>23 A. I have no control over what I</p> <p>24 will be asked. I am merely responding to</p> <p>25 what Mr. Kosty put in his report. And</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 know what it means.</p> <p>3 What Mr. Kosty said is that</p> <p>4 the product still had value and should be</p> <p>5 assigned some value and that I had failed</p> <p>6 to take that into account. And what I'm</p> <p>7 saying is that I do not believe that</p> <p>8 contaminated drugs, with the potential to</p> <p>9 cause a serious condition such as cancer,</p> <p>10 have value.</p> <p>11 I think it is simply -- it's</p> <p>12 just a completely false premise that if</p> <p>13 you put on the label of a drug that was</p> <p>14 being dispensed to a consumer a big sign</p> <p>15 that says contains MDMA, known to cause</p> <p>16 cancer, that the consumer is going to</p> <p>17 purchase it or that their prescribers can</p> <p>18 prescribe it or that the FDA will allow</p> <p>19 that to go on.</p> <p>20 So I don't understand</p> <p>21 Mr. Kosty's argument that you should</p> <p>22 still credit some value to this just</p> <p>23 because the products did, in fact, lower</p> <p>24 high blood pressure. But I think it's a</p> <p>25 completely unreal construction of the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 although he didn't use the word</p> <p>3 "quality", which is the word that you</p> <p>4 just used in your question, he certainly</p> <p>5 took the position that these drugs still</p> <p>6 had value no matter how much</p> <p>7 cancer-causing contamination they might</p> <p>8 contain.</p> <p>9 I strenuously disagree with</p> <p>10 that opinion. I do not believe anyone, if</p> <p>11 they were told that these drugs had the</p> <p>12 potential to induce cancer, would have</p> <p>13 chosen to purchase them, nor do I believe</p> <p>14 that that would have been consistent with</p> <p>15 Federal drug regulation.</p> <p>16 Q. You stated that in response to</p> <p>17 Mr. Kosty's report your opinion is that</p> <p>18 if the contamination did exist, then the</p> <p>19 quality would be unacceptable. What does</p> <p>20 "unacceptable" mean?</p> <p>21 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>22 form.</p> <p>23 A. I did not use the word</p> <p>24 quality, you did. And I was specifically</p> <p>25 careful not to use it because I don't</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 world that is effectively designed to</p> <p>3 create a get out of jail free card for a</p> <p>4 manufacturer that knowingly sells</p> <p>5 adulterated drugs. And I am expressing no</p> <p>6 opinion about whether the defendants in</p> <p>7 this case did knowingly sell adulterated</p> <p>8 drugs.</p> <p>9 I am saying that if they did</p> <p>10 so it, to me, is preposterous to argue;</p> <p>11 okay, yeah, they were adulterated but</p> <p>12 they still had some beneficial</p> <p>13 characteristics. That's not the point.</p> <p>14 Q. Ms. Craft, you're not an</p> <p>15 expert in consumer behavior, correct?</p> <p>16 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>17 form.</p> <p>18 A. Well, I don't know what the</p> <p>19 field consumer behavior means, but I</p> <p>20 certainly do know that I have studied</p> <p>21 over the years responses to black box</p> <p>22 warnings, and how they affect sales of</p> <p>23 products. But no, I don't purport to be</p> <p>24 an expert in consumer behavior. I</p> <p>25 understand the field of pharmaceutical</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 sales and regulation.</p> <p>3 Q. And in this case, you have not</p> <p>4 performed any kind of survey or other</p> <p>5 analysis to determine whether consumers</p> <p>6 would continue taking valsartan if they</p> <p>7 were aware of some kind of alleged</p> <p>8 contamination?</p> <p>9 A. I have conducted no surveys.</p> <p>10 MS. BRANCATO: Okay. We've</p> <p>11 been going about an hour and a half</p> <p>12 now, so why don't we take a quick</p> <p>13 five minute break, if that's okay</p> <p>14 with you guys.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: Five minutes is</p> <p>16 fine.</p> <p>17 MS. BRANCATO: We can take</p> <p>18 longer, Ms. Craft, if you want.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: No, I do not</p> <p>20 need a longer break. Five minutes</p> <p>21 will be just fine. Thank you.</p> <p>22 VIDEOGRAPHER: Time is 9:32.</p> <p>23 This ends Media Unit 1. Going off</p> <p>24 the record.</p> <p>25 (Recess is taken.)</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 reported in the PBM data is the amount,</p> <p>3 in fact, paid by Emblem and Summa.</p> <p>4 Q. And you don't have any</p> <p>5 calculations, sitting here today or in</p> <p>6 your report, about any potential</p> <p>7 alternative values for damages, correct?</p> <p>8 A. I think it's fundamentally</p> <p>9 wrong to try to calculate an alternative</p> <p>10 value.</p> <p>11 Q. So the answer is no?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, you're right.</p> <p>13 Q. Ms. Craft, you're not offering</p> <p>14 any opinions related to the manufacturing</p> <p>15 of the valsartan drugs on Exhibit D,</p> <p>16 correct?</p> <p>17 A. The manufacturing practices;</p> <p>18 is that what you're asking?</p> <p>19 Q. Anything related to the</p> <p>20 manufacturing of the valsartan drugs on</p> <p>21 Exhibit D.</p> <p>22 A. Only the fact that the data</p> <p>23 makes it possible to identify who the</p> <p>24 manufacturers were.</p> <p>25 Q. And the data you're referring</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is</p> <p>3 9:42 and this is unit 2 and we are</p> <p>4 back on the record.</p> <p>5 Q. Ms. Craft, the issue of</p> <p>6 whether the valsartan drugs at issue in</p> <p>7 this case have value or not is -- does</p> <p>8 not affect the question of whether the</p> <p>9 PBM claims data that you looked at is</p> <p>10 sufficient to identify MSP's potential</p> <p>11 damages in this case, correct?</p> <p>12 A. Well, although the sound was</p> <p>13 very blurry on your last three words</p> <p>14 there, the claim damages, as I understand</p> <p>15 it, are the amounts, in fact, paid by MSP</p> <p>16 for those products.</p> <p>17 And you're right, if</p> <p>18 defendants accept the theory that the</p> <p>19 damages are comprised of the total amount</p> <p>20 of those payments then, yes, the data is</p> <p>21 totally adequate to do that.</p> <p>22 I only raise the question of a</p> <p>23 possible alternative value, which I think</p> <p>24 is an inappropriate approach because it</p> <p>25 was raised by Mr. Kosty. What the value</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 to is PBM claims data, right?</p> <p>3 A. Any data that uses the NDC</p> <p>4 makes it possible to identify the</p> <p>5 manufacturer for the reasons explained in</p> <p>6 my initial report. And my opinion on this</p> <p>7 subject is limited to observing that the</p> <p>8 special data requirements and product</p> <p>9 identification in the pharmaceutical</p> <p>10 industry are designed very specifically</p> <p>11 to allow the product to be linked back to</p> <p>12 its manufacturer.</p> <p>13 Q. Ms. Craft, you just mentioned</p> <p>14 the discussion in your earlier report</p> <p>15 related to the NDC codes.</p> <p>16 There are similarities between</p> <p>17 your October 2022 report and your</p> <p>18 November 2021 report, correct?</p> <p>19 A. Similarities? Yes, because my</p> <p>20 basic perspective on how data operates in</p> <p>21 the pharmaceutical industry and for these</p> <p>22 drugs did not change.</p> <p>23 Q. And there are some paragraphs</p> <p>24 in your October 2022 report that are</p> <p>25 exactly the same as they were in your</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 74</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 November 2021 report; is that right?</p> <p>3 A. Yes. Because those same</p> <p>4 subjects are relevant specifically to</p> <p>5 what are now the bellwether claims and</p> <p>6 parties.</p> <p>7 Q. Let's look as paragraph 9,</p> <p>8 please, of Exhibit 3 this is discussing</p> <p>9 NDC codes, correct?</p> <p>10 A. Yes. Paragraph 9 does discuss</p> <p>11 NDC codes.</p> <p>12 Q. The NDC code doesn't tell you</p> <p>13 what lot number a given prescription was</p> <p>14 filled from, correct?</p> <p>15 A. It does not.</p> <p>16 Q. And multiple lots of a drug</p> <p>17 product can have the same NDC code,</p> <p>18 correct?</p> <p>19 A. They not only can, they must.</p> <p>20 A NDC code pertains to a higher category.</p> <p>21 A lot is a subdivision based on</p> <p>22 production dates and locations of that</p> <p>23 NDC.</p> <p>24 Q. Look at paragraph 14 of your</p> <p>25 report, please. Ms. Craft, in this</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 The second, which actually has</p> <p>3 a couple of components, is determining</p> <p>4 how the drug is going to be treated and</p> <p>5 that means specifically what is its tier</p> <p>6 on a formulary and what is the benefit</p> <p>7 design of the plan. So the use of co-pays</p> <p>8 versus co-deductibles, whether the drug,</p> <p>9 itself, is even covered or whether it is</p> <p>10 excluded from the plan's formulary.</p> <p>11 So all of those things are</p> <p>12 determined using the combination of</p> <p>13 benefit design data and the formulary for</p> <p>14 the plan.</p> <p>15 Then, third, which really</p> <p>16 should be broken down into two parts,</p> <p>17 third and fourth, the third, the</p> <p>18 adjudication process sets the price that</p> <p>19 will be paid to the pharmacy and it does</p> <p>20 so by consulting the PBM's electronic</p> <p>21 records of the negotiated prices with the</p> <p>22 particular pharmacy where the</p> <p>23 prescription is being filled, and that</p> <p>24 sets the ingredient cost that will be</p> <p>25 charged. It also simultaneously sets the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 paragraph you list -- you say claims</p> <p>3 adjudication performs four basic</p> <p>4 functions, and then you go on to list</p> <p>5 first, second and third, but I don't see</p> <p>6 a fourth. So I just wanted to ask you is</p> <p>7 there a forth and, if so, where is it or</p> <p>8 should it be that there are three basic</p> <p>9 functions? I just want to make sure we're</p> <p>10 not missing anything.</p> <p>11 A. Well, that's an embarrassing</p> <p>12 oversight. Let me expand on this.</p> <p>13 The truth is you can break</p> <p>14 this down into lots of subparts. You can</p> <p>15 break it down into nine or ten functions</p> <p>16 that are performed.</p> <p>17 What I was trying to capture</p> <p>18 here is that the eligibility is</p> <p>19 determined through claims adjudication,</p> <p>20 meaning is the consumer covered by the</p> <p>21 plan. The second -- and that, by the way,</p> <p>22 means consulting the electronic</p> <p>23 enrollment records to make sure that the</p> <p>24 consumer is still a beneficiary of the</p> <p>25 plan.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 77</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 dispensing fee that will be paid to that</p> <p>3 pharmacy.</p> <p>4 Then, really, the final step</p> <p>5 of relevance here is that that ingredient</p> <p>6 cost gets split in this process between</p> <p>7 the consumer and the third-party payor,</p> <p>8 Emblem and Summa in this case, gets</p> <p>9 divided into two parts that, when put</p> <p>10 together, cover the entire approved</p> <p>11 ingredient cost and, thereby, creates</p> <p>12 effectively the payment obligation of the</p> <p>13 plan sponsor, Emblem or Summa, and the</p> <p>14 consumer, to pay the pharmacy. It also,</p> <p>15 of course, creates the electronic record</p> <p>16 of the plan sponsor's obligation to pay a</p> <p>17 dispensing fee to the pharmacy for the</p> <p>18 transaction.</p> <p>19 So, and as I point out here,</p> <p>20 this later allocation calculation goes</p> <p>21 back and takes into account the claim</p> <p>22 history of the individual consumer by</p> <p>23 looking at whether they've paid their</p> <p>24 out-of-pocket deductible, whether there</p> <p>25 are any caps.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 78</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 And I should add to the</p> <p>3 purpose of this discussion specifically</p> <p>4 about Emblem and SummaCare, since they</p> <p>5 are Medicare Part D plans, also a record</p> <p>6 of the coverage phase in which the</p> <p>7 consumer currently sits at the time the</p> <p>8 prescription is filled. And that coverage</p> <p>9 phase is determined by the consumer's</p> <p>10 TrOOP dollar amount, so their true</p> <p>11 out-of-pocket dollar amount, which is</p> <p>12 separately tracked for all Medicare Part</p> <p>13 D plans by the TrOOP facilitator, which</p> <p>14 during the period we're looking at here,</p> <p>15 was Relay Health, which operated as a</p> <p>16 TrOOP facilitator across all Med d plans,</p> <p>17 to keep track of each individual's</p> <p>18 out-of-pocket contributions so that it</p> <p>19 was possible to determine when they</p> <p>20 progressed from the deductible phase to</p> <p>21 the initial coverage phase, from the</p> <p>22 initial coverage phase to the gap phase,</p> <p>23 from the gap phase, having met the</p> <p>24 out-of-pocket threshold, to the</p> <p>25 catastrophic phase.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 80</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 determine that by the extremely low cost</p> <p>3 share of the consumer, but that would be</p> <p>4 an inference as opposed to an explicit</p> <p>5 determination.</p> <p>6 That explicit determination,</p> <p>7 based on the up-to-date TrOOP values at</p> <p>8 the moment that each of these purchases</p> <p>9 occurred was already made to arrive at</p> <p>10 those dollar amounts. But no, the field</p> <p>11 that identifies the phase of coverage in</p> <p>12 which the consumer sits is not included</p> <p>13 in this data.</p> <p>14 Q. And when you say you could</p> <p>15 infer it based on extremely low cost, is</p> <p>16 there a threshold that you would use?</p> <p>17 A. So I said cost share, not</p> <p>18 cost. There is a difference.</p> <p>19 So the point is that in the</p> <p>20 catastrophic phase the consumer's portion</p> <p>21 of the ingredient cost drops dramatically</p> <p>22 and is typically quite small. I have not</p> <p>23 attempted to study for these -- for this</p> <p>24 data and these plans what the consumer</p> <p>25 shares look like and how they changed, so</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 79</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Q. Is there anything else that</p> <p>3 you'd add to paragraph 14.</p> <p>4 A. Well, I could supply many more</p> <p>5 details but I think conceptually those</p> <p>6 are the moving parts that are relevant</p> <p>7 for this particular dispute.</p> <p>8 Q. The MSP data that you reviewed</p> <p>9 from December of 2022, does it include</p> <p>10 information about coverage phase?</p> <p>11 A. No, it does not. But that is</p> <p>12 implicitly used to perform the</p> <p>13 calculation for which you see the payment</p> <p>14 obligations reported. In other words,</p> <p>15 that's an essential precursor to arriving</p> <p>16 at that split of the drug cost between</p> <p>17 the consumer and the plan.</p> <p>18 Q. Looking at the PBM data -- I'm</p> <p>19 sorry. Strike that.</p> <p>20 Looking at the MSP data from</p> <p>21 December 2022, is there any way to know</p> <p>22 whether a particular transaction came</p> <p>23 from a particular customer that was in</p> <p>24 the catastrophic phase, for example?</p> <p>25 A. Inferentially one could</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 81</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 I wouldn't want to express any opinion</p> <p>3 about the ability to reliably identify</p> <p>4 phase of coverage from each of the</p> <p>5 additional costs -- from each of the</p> <p>6 reported cost allocations.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. So sitting here today,</p> <p>8 you don't have an opinion about the</p> <p>9 ability to reliably identify phase of</p> <p>10 coverage from the cost allocations in the</p> <p>11 PBM -- I'm sorry -- the MSP data; is that</p> <p>12 right?</p> <p>13 A. That's right. It's not a</p> <p>14 question I've analyzed and I, therefore,</p> <p>15 can't give you an opinion about that, as</p> <p>16 we sit here.</p> <p>17 Q. Let's look at paragraph 21.</p> <p>18 Your opinion is that in order to</p> <p>19 determine damages for EmblemHealth or</p> <p>20 SummaCare we just have to look at the PBM</p> <p>21 data; is that right?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, I would say that is</p> <p>23 accurate. The paragraph that you are</p> <p>24 currently showing me on the screen is a</p> <p>25 piece of background information that</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 82</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 pertains to non-insured consumers. It is</p> <p>3 not specifically relevant to Emblem or</p> <p>4 SummaCare.</p> <p>5 There shouldn't be any need</p> <p>6 for pharmacy data of any kind for Emblem</p> <p>7 or SummaCare purchases precisely because</p> <p>8 they do go through the PBM adjudication</p> <p>9 process.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. So for determining the</p> <p>11 amount of EmblemCare -- I'm sorry --</p> <p>12 EmblemHealth or SummaCare damages, we</p> <p>13 don't need to look at any pharmacy</p> <p>14 records; is that right?</p> <p>15 A. Yes, I would agree with that.</p> <p>16 Q. And we don't really need to</p> <p>17 look at anything except the PBM claims</p> <p>18 data; is that right?</p> <p>19 A. That is my opinion. And I</p> <p>20 should say you are repeatedly using,</p> <p>21 Ms. Brancato, the phrase "the PBM data".</p> <p>22 I want to be more specific.</p> <p>23 MSP has produced claims data</p> <p>24 which was sourced from the PBM data. So I</p> <p>25 am -- I don't mean in answering your</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 84</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Q. You are aware that Medicare</p> <p>3 Part D sponsors such as Emblem and Summa</p> <p>4 have financial arrangements with CMC --</p> <p>5 or CMS? Sorry.</p> <p>6 A. Well, let me just be a little</p> <p>7 more precise, if I may.</p> <p>8 Medicare Part D plan sponsors</p> <p>9 have reporting obligations to CMS. They</p> <p>10 have data retention obligations in their</p> <p>11 contracts with CMS.</p> <p>12 With regard to financial</p> <p>13 arrangements, there are a set of</p> <p>14 statutory and regulatory structures for</p> <p>15 computing subsidies that will be paid to</p> <p>16 plan sponsors through CMS by effectively</p> <p>17 the Federal government.</p> <p>18 If what you are referring to</p> <p>19 are the subsidy arrangements, these are</p> <p>20 -- these are not individually negotiated</p> <p>21 contract terms, they're just the</p> <p>22 structural parameters under which</p> <p>23 Medicare Part D plans operate.</p> <p>24 Yes, those arrangements, if</p> <p>25 you want to use that term, I am hesitant</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 83</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 questions to imply that it is necessary</p> <p>3 to go back to the PBM.</p> <p>4 Q. Understood. I appreciate that</p> <p>5 clarification and I will try to be more</p> <p>6 precise.</p> <p>7 Ms. Craft, you mentioned</p> <p>8 earlier that EmblemHealth and SummaCare</p> <p>9 are Medicare Part D sponsors, right?</p> <p>10 A. That's right.</p> <p>11 Q. And as Medicare Part D</p> <p>12 sponsors, both EmblemHealth and SummaCare</p> <p>13 have financial arrangements with the</p> <p>14 Centers For Medicare and Medicaid</p> <p>15 Services; is that right?</p> <p>16 A. Yes, the kind of standard</p> <p>17 contracting that every insurer offering a</p> <p>18 Medicare Part D plan is required to</p> <p>19 execute with CMS.</p> <p>20 Q. And part of that standard</p> <p>21 contracting are special financial</p> <p>22 arrangements specific to Medicare part D</p> <p>23 plans, correct?</p> <p>24 A. I have no idea what you mean</p> <p>25 by "special financial arrangements".</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 85</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 about that because it suggests an</p> <p>3 individually negotiated set of rules,</p> <p>4 which these are absolutely not, those</p> <p>5 structures are referred to in the</p> <p>6 contracts. And they are, once again,</p> <p>7 applicable, they exist by virtue of</p> <p>8 statute and regulation and they are</p> <p>9 consistent across the plans.</p> <p>10 Q. You are aware that</p> <p>11 EmblemHealth and SummaCare, as Medicare</p> <p>12 Part D sponsors, receive subsidies from</p> <p>13 the Federal government, correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, I believe I just referred</p> <p>15 to that in my last answer.</p> <p>16 Q. And the government subsidies</p> <p>17 that are paid to Medicare Part D sponsors</p> <p>18 like Emblem and Summa ultimately impact</p> <p>19 the net price paid for a particular</p> <p>20 prescription, correct?</p> <p>21 A. I don't know what you mean by</p> <p>22 "net price".</p> <p>23 MS. BRANCATO: Hey, Dave, I</p> <p>24 saw your mouth move but no</p> <p>25 objection was noted. I'm just</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 86</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 worried you might not be connected</p> <p>3 and I wanted to clarify.</p> <p>4 MR. STANOCH: Thank you. I was</p> <p>5 objecting to form. I actually tried</p> <p>6 to object to form a couple of</p> <p>7 earlier ones, but thank you for</p> <p>8 noting it.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: I apologize, I</p> <p>10 didn't see that.</p> <p>11 MR. STANOCH: Not your fault,</p> <p>12 Ms. Craft.</p> <p>13 Q. The government subsidies that</p> <p>14 are paid to Medicare Part D sponsors like</p> <p>15 Emblem and Summa impact the price that</p> <p>16 those Medicare Part D sponsors may pay</p> <p>17 for any given prescription, correct?</p> <p>18 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>19 form.</p> <p>20 A. The price is the price that is</p> <p>21 negotiated with the pharmacy and it is</p> <p>22 required to be accurately and correctly</p> <p>23 reported to CMS by the plan sponsors. I</p> <p>24 believe that what your question is trying</p> <p>25 to get at is the assumption that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 88</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 mischaracterizes their function and</p> <p>3 operation in the overall Medicare Part D</p> <p>4 structure.</p> <p>5 Q. What specifically is Mr. Kosty</p> <p>6 ignoring about the underlying purpose and</p> <p>7 function of the subsidiaries --</p> <p>8 subsidies? You know what I'm saying?</p> <p>9 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>10 form. But go ahead, Ms. Craft.</p> <p>11 (Reporter clarification.)</p> <p>12 Q. Let me restart.</p> <p>13 Ms. Craft, what specifically</p> <p>14 is Mr. Kosty ignoring about the</p> <p>15 underlying purpose and function of the</p> <p>16 subsidies?</p> <p>17 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>18 form.</p> <p>19 A. Okay. Mr. Kosty assumes that</p> <p>20 where there is funding, and he uses that</p> <p>21 term, supplied by the Federal government</p> <p>22 to Part D sponsors, it is effectively an</p> <p>23 offset on the price paid for any</p> <p>24 individual drug. I disagree with that</p> <p>25 basic construct.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 87</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 subsidies somehow change that price. That</p> <p>3 is a position I would not agree with.</p> <p>4 Q. And why don't you agree?</p> <p>5 A. Because they don't. The way</p> <p>6 these subsidies are structured is,</p> <p>7 although the amount of subsidies may be</p> <p>8 calculated by the summation of prices</p> <p>9 actually paid across all drugs purchased,</p> <p>10 paid for or reimbursed by the Medicare</p> <p>11 Part D sponsors, it is not the case that</p> <p>12 the subsidy is changing the price that</p> <p>13 was charged and paid at the time of sale</p> <p>14 by that drug.</p> <p>15 Q. Is the subsidy changing the</p> <p>16 ultimate cost for by Emblem or Summa?</p> <p>17 MR. STANOCH: Objection do</p> <p>18 form.</p> <p>19 A. No. And I think -- I think</p> <p>20 this is the problem with Mr. Kosty's</p> <p>21 report, is that it ignores the underlying</p> <p>22 purpose and function of these subsidies.</p> <p>23 He refers to how there are</p> <p>24 four types of subsidies and briefly</p> <p>25 mentions each of them, but I think he</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 89</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Every business seeks to fund</p> <p>3 all of its costs. It is generally the</p> <p>4 case that businesses do not embark</p> <p>5 intending to create losses. This is</p> <p>6 absolutely true for insurance companies.</p> <p>7 The word "funding" is a word</p> <p>8 that is generally used in healthcare</p> <p>9 finance to refer to all of the sources of</p> <p>10 funds that the business has to use in its</p> <p>11 operations. So those may include consumer</p> <p>12 premium, they may include contributions</p> <p>13 from other sources and Mr. Kosty singles</p> <p>14 out the Federal contributions to the</p> <p>15 funds used by these Part D sponsors as</p> <p>16 though they had some unique and specific</p> <p>17 characteristic that transforms them into</p> <p>18 an assumption of liability to pay for a</p> <p>19 particular purchase price. And there are</p> <p>20 two reasons why I think that is just</p> <p>21 fundamentally wrong.</p> <p>22 The first reason why I think</p> <p>23 it's fundamentally wrong is that it</p> <p>24 overlooks the purpose and intent behind</p> <p>25 the creation of Medicare Part D, which</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 90</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 became effective -- was enacted in 2003</p> <p>3 and became effective in 2006.</p> <p>4 This country was facing a</p> <p>5 growing crisis over the cost of</p> <p>6 prescription medications and, more</p> <p>7 specifically, the ability of those 65 and</p> <p>8 older, so probably would have been called</p> <p>9 at the time senior citizens to afford to</p> <p>10 buy their prescription medications.</p> <p>11 Insurance was becoming</p> <p>12 increasingly difficult to find that</p> <p>13 provided adequate prescription drug</p> <p>14 coverage for those individuals and as a</p> <p>15 result many of them did not have drug</p> <p>16 coverage or were paying extremely high</p> <p>17 out-of-pocket cost shares.</p> <p>18 This was recognized to present</p> <p>19 an enormous public health challenge</p> <p>20 simply because there was affordable</p> <p>21 prescription drug coverage that would</p> <p>22 specifically target this population.</p> <p>23 The group of individuals that</p> <p>24 are covered by Part D, consisting of</p> <p>25 those 65 and older and those are</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 92</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 and you end up with only the sickest of</p> <p>3 the sick choosing to enroll. They have</p> <p>4 prices that are higher and higher, the</p> <p>5 premium has to continue to rise to</p> <p>6 accommodate them, to cover those costs,</p> <p>7 and at the end of the day, we have no</p> <p>8 insurance for this vulnerable population.</p> <p>9 So what Medicare Part D</p> <p>10 attempted to do was to substitute some of</p> <p>11 the costs that would ordinarily be paid</p> <p>12 by consumer enrollees with a series of --</p> <p>13 with a number of different kinds of</p> <p>14 Federal subsidies that would effectively</p> <p>15 supplant that other revenue source with</p> <p>16 something else that would allow a</p> <p>17 commercial insurer to operate profitably</p> <p>18 in this space.</p> <p>19 Commercial insurers do not</p> <p>20 offer insurance plans where they do not</p> <p>21 believe they can make a profit. They are</p> <p>22 businesses and it was the specific</p> <p>23 intention in adopting Medicare Part D</p> <p>24 that the Federal government develop a</p> <p>25 program which would be sufficiently</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 91</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 permanently disabled, as determined by</p> <p>3 two years enrollment in Social Security</p> <p>4 due to disability status, is that they</p> <p>5 are high-risk consumers. This is what we</p> <p>6 call in the field of healthcare</p> <p>7 insurance, a high-risk pool and they're</p> <p>8 high risk because they're going to use</p> <p>9 more medications than the average</p> <p>10 consumer and across all age ranges and</p> <p>11 demographics and those drugs are likely</p> <p>12 also to be more expensive.</p> <p>13 So the problem was, so given</p> <p>14 the limited capacity of this population,</p> <p>15 combined with their high need for</p> <p>16 prescription drugs, there was no such</p> <p>17 thing as a plan that would single them</p> <p>18 out as a group of potential members and</p> <p>19 would want to cover them, because any</p> <p>20 price that that insurer would have to</p> <p>21 charge as premiums would be impossible</p> <p>22 for the consumers to pay in the aggregate</p> <p>23 and the plan, itself, would go into what</p> <p>24 is sometimes described as a death spiral,</p> <p>25 in which adverse selection plays a role</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 93</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 attractive to commercial insurers to</p> <p>3 incent them to offer these plans but</p> <p>4 would also retain sufficient risk</p> <p>5 characteristics so that those commercial</p> <p>6 insurers would act responsibly to control</p> <p>7 costs in the interest of protecting their</p> <p>8 own profits. That meant that the program</p> <p>9 had to have downside and upside for the</p> <p>10 insurer, just as it always did -- does in</p> <p>11 commercial insurance and that the</p> <p>12 subsidies were a way effectively of</p> <p>13 getting sufficient additional funds into</p> <p>14 the program to substitute for amounts</p> <p>15 that the covered members, themselves,</p> <p>16 simply could not pay.</p> <p>17 So I think when we look at the</p> <p>18 overall structure, intent, clear purpose</p> <p>19 behind Medicare Part D, what those</p> <p>20 Federal subsidies do is they substitute</p> <p>21 for amounts that would otherwise in a</p> <p>22 non-subsidized insurance market be paid</p> <p>23 by the consumer.</p> <p>24 So I see no logic behind the</p> <p>25 argument that because it's Federal Funds</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 94</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 as opposed to premium that would come in</p> <p>3 from a consumer or larger co-pays that</p> <p>4 would come in from a consumer, that these</p> <p>5 dollars are any different. They are a</p> <p>6 funding source. And so I do not agree</p> <p>7 with the basic assumption that anything</p> <p>8 the Federal government pays is something</p> <p>9 other than an amount that would have been</p> <p>10 paid for by consumers in a standard</p> <p>11 prescription drug plan.</p> <p>12 And I know this has been a</p> <p>13 very long answer but it's kind of an</p> <p>14 important concept and I -- I just want to</p> <p>15 add one more thing.</p> <p>16 When we're comparing a</p> <p>17 Medicare Part D plan to another kind of</p> <p>18 commercial insurance offering</p> <p>19 prescription drug coverage, it's</p> <p>20 important to understand that when the</p> <p>21 insurers price their plans to consumers</p> <p>22 when they're not subsidized, they're</p> <p>23 taking into account all of the projected</p> <p>24 costs, i.e., costs of drugs that will be</p> <p>25 purchased by their members just the same</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 96</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 questions about that answer but when you</p> <p>3 first started responding you said that</p> <p>4 you think there are two reasons why</p> <p>5 Mr. Kosty is singling out Federal</p> <p>6 contributions was fundamentally wrong and</p> <p>7 then you said, number one, the purpose</p> <p>8 and intent behind Medicare Part D.</p> <p>9 Is there a number two or what</p> <p>10 is number two?</p> <p>11 A. Yeah. Number two is simply he</p> <p>12 says repeatedly in his report that these</p> <p>13 plan sponsors are not at risk. And that</p> <p>14 is just flatly wrong and it's</p> <p>15 contradicted by his own report where he</p> <p>16 only tells you half the story. He talks</p> <p>17 about the fact that losses may be shared</p> <p>18 with CMS. He doesn't quite accurately</p> <p>19 describe how that happens. But it is true</p> <p>20 that where total drug costs exceed the</p> <p>21 amount that was budgeted at the beginning</p> <p>22 of the year by -- where the total drug</p> <p>23 costs are more than 105% of what was</p> <p>24 budgeted, that there is a sharing of the</p> <p>25 resulting losses effectively those costs</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 95</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 way that Medicare Part D does. They</p> <p>3 undertake actuarial exercises where they</p> <p>4 say, we think we're going to have X</p> <p>5 number of people with minimal usage of</p> <p>6 the plan, Y number of people with</p> <p>7 moderate usage, we're going to have Z</p> <p>8 number of people who are going to have</p> <p>9 high claims levels.</p> <p>10 They do the same kind of</p> <p>11 targeting and estimation as the Federal</p> <p>12 government does. There is nothing special</p> <p>13 about that. That's how premiums are</p> <p>14 calculated, using actuarial science to</p> <p>15 cover costs. And I think the fact that</p> <p>16 Medicare Part D has a more specifically</p> <p>17 and compartmentalized way of doing that</p> <p>18 that's very visible to us through the</p> <p>19 subsidies doesn't change the substance of</p> <p>20 what's going on.</p> <p>21 Okay. That was a long answer,</p> <p>22 but that's the basic paradigm that I</p> <p>23 think is completely missing from</p> <p>24 Mr. Kosty's report.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. I'll ask some followup</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 97</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 between CMS and the plan sponsor.</p> <p>3 First of all, that -- that</p> <p>4 risk-sharing is symmetric. It applies to</p> <p>5 lower than expected drug costs as well as</p> <p>6 higher than expected drug costs. The</p> <p>7 corridor is a 5% difference on either</p> <p>8 side. In that 10% range, the consequences</p> <p>9 belong 100% to the plan sponsor. They</p> <p>10 take the loss, they get the profit.</p> <p>11 That's how it works. And even outside of</p> <p>12 that 10% range, the variance from the</p> <p>13 originally budgeted costs is only shared</p> <p>14 pursuant to a percentage formula between</p> <p>15 CMS and the plan sponsor. So any</p> <p>16 statements that they do not operate at</p> <p>17 risk are just wrong and very misleading.</p> <p>18 It makes it sounds as though</p> <p>19 the plan sponsor is nothing but an</p> <p>20 administrative agent for the Federal</p> <p>21 government, and that's not true.</p> <p>22 CMS has no responsibility to</p> <p>23 pay the pharmacy. CMS has no</p> <p>24 responsibility to members under these</p> <p>25 plans to pay their claims. CMS is not a</p>

25 (Pages 94 - 97)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 98</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 party to these plans that are offered to</p> <p>3 the market.</p> <p>4 It agrees to make Federal</p> <p>5 subsidy funding available to the plan</p> <p>6 sponsor but it is not a party to that</p> <p>7 purchase obligation, that purchase</p> <p>8 transaction, and it has no duties or</p> <p>9 obligations in connection with that</p> <p>10 transaction. It is a secondary source of</p> <p>11 funding to the plan sponsor and nothing</p> <p>12 more.</p> <p>13 So I don't think whatever CMS</p> <p>14 used is relevant to the question; how</p> <p>15 much did these plans, in fact, pay for</p> <p>16 drugs that allegedly should not have been</p> <p>17 sold or made available to their members?</p> <p>18 Q. So the bottom line is that,</p> <p>19 and correct me if I'm wrong, I just want</p> <p>20 to make sure I'm understanding what your</p> <p>21 opinion is today, any CMS subsidies,</p> <p>22 reimbursements, whatever types of phrase</p> <p>23 you want to use, any amounts that went</p> <p>24 from CMS to EmblemHealth or SummaCare are</p> <p>25 irrelevant for purposes of calculating</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 100</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 that comes from CMS somehow damages are</p> <p>3 accused is fundamentally incorrect.</p> <p>4 Q. The information you just gave</p> <p>5 us about the history of Medicare Part D</p> <p>6 and the purpose behind it is not in your</p> <p>7 October 2022 report, correct?</p> <p>8 MR. STANOCH: Objection. Go</p> <p>9 ahead.</p> <p>10 A. No. Because it is directly</p> <p>11 responsive to Mr. Kosty's report, which</p> <p>12 was not filed until I think December 19</p> <p>13 of this year.</p> <p>14 Q. Do you plan on issuing a</p> <p>15 supplemental report that does address</p> <p>16 these issues related to Medicare Part D</p> <p>17 subsidiaries?</p> <p>18 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>19 form, calls for speculation.</p> <p>20 A. I don't have any idea. I don't</p> <p>21 know what the court ordered report</p> <p>22 process is and what may happen. That is</p> <p>23 not up to me.</p> <p>24 If asked to issue a report, I</p> <p>25 will put in writing what I just said to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 99</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 the damages that Emblem or SummaCare may</p> <p>3 have incurred in this case?</p> <p>4 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>5 form.</p> <p>6 A. But you're correct, that is my</p> <p>7 opinion. I think what is relevant is the</p> <p>8 amount that the plans paid the</p> <p>9 pharmacies, and they did pay those</p> <p>10 amounts to the pharmacies.</p> <p>11 Mr. Kosty even -- doesn't even</p> <p>12 dispute that in his report. He doesn't</p> <p>13 even dispute that the PBM data correctly</p> <p>14 reports the amounts that were paid by the</p> <p>15 plan sponsors to the pharmacies. And I</p> <p>16 think that is the correct value to look</p> <p>17 at in damages.</p> <p>18 Now, I'm not -- I am not the</p> <p>19 damages expert in this case. I have not</p> <p>20 been asked and do not expect to express</p> <p>21 any opinions about damages, but I did</p> <p>22 need to respond to the fact that I think</p> <p>23 Mr. Kosty's assumption that just because</p> <p>24 the plans have a source of funding in</p> <p>25 lieu of higher charges to their members</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 101</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 you under oath in this deposition.</p> <p>3 Q. So right now you don't have</p> <p>4 any plans or aren't aware of any request</p> <p>5 to draft a report that says what you just</p> <p>6 said in this deposition, correct?</p> <p>7 MR. STANOCH: Objection.</p> <p>8 A. That's correct.</p> <p>9 Q. If a consumer pays more for</p> <p>10 co-pays then a plan sponsor like Emblem</p> <p>11 ultimately pays less overall to cover</p> <p>12 that particular consumer, correct?</p> <p>13 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>14 form. Unintelligible. Go ahead.</p> <p>15 A. Ms. Brancato, is your question</p> <p>16 that given a fixed ingredient cost if the</p> <p>17 consumer pays a bigger piece of it the</p> <p>18 plan pays a smaller piece? Is that what</p> <p>19 you're asking?</p> <p>20 Q. Sure. We can use that example.</p> <p>21 A. Yeah.</p> <p>22 Q. Is that correct?</p> <p>23 A. That's correct. Because what</p> <p>24 the plan pays is the residual after the</p> <p>25 consumer's cost share.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 102</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Q. You mention risk-sharing and</p> <p>3 the fact that if there are lower than</p> <p>4 expected costs within that 5% range, that</p> <p>5 is risk borne by third-party payors or</p> <p>6 Medicare Part D like Emblem and Summa,</p> <p>7 right?</p> <p>8 A. I think you said lower rather</p> <p>9 than higher in your question.</p> <p>10 If the drug costs are lower</p> <p>11 than expected, then that's more profit</p> <p>12 and so at that point that profit up to a</p> <p>13 5% difference between the actual and</p> <p>14 projected cost is retained by the plan</p> <p>15 sponsor.</p> <p>16 It's the other direction,</p> <p>17 where if the costs are higher than</p> <p>18 expected, just like any business, if</p> <p>19 you're running a business and your costs</p> <p>20 end up being higher than expected, you</p> <p>21 might put yourself into a loss position.</p> <p>22 And it is true that because the cost, the</p> <p>23 fundamental cost of operating a</p> <p>24 prescription drug plan is paying for the</p> <p>25 drugs, if those costs are greater than</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 104</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>3 form. Go ahead.</p> <p>4 A. If the drug costs are less</p> <p>5 than 95% of originally budgeted, then a</p> <p>6 portion of that cost savings, a portion,</p> <p>7 never all, a portion of that cost savings</p> <p>8 would be shared with CMS.</p> <p>9 Q. And in the same way it's your</p> <p>10 opinion that we shouldn't take into</p> <p>11 account any payments from CMS to Summa or</p> <p>12 Emblem as a result of prescription costs</p> <p>13 going over the original budget, I assume</p> <p>14 it's also your opinion that we also</p> <p>15 shouldn't take into account any portion</p> <p>16 of the -- all or any portion of the</p> <p>17 profit sharing that happens with CMS if</p> <p>18 prescription amounts are lower than the</p> <p>19 budget, correct?</p> <p>20 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>21 form.</p> <p>22 A. Yes. I would agree with your</p> <p>23 statement. And I would point out that</p> <p>24 this would be literally dancing on the</p> <p>25 head of a pin to say that the amounts</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 103</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 expected, then you may lose money and</p> <p>3 that risk is borne exclusively by the</p> <p>4 plan sponsor up to the point of a 5%</p> <p>5 increase over the projected cost and,</p> <p>6 thereafter, is shared with the Federal</p> <p>7 government.</p> <p>8 Q. On the flip side that you</p> <p>9 started talking about at the beginning of</p> <p>10 your answer, if drug costs are lower than</p> <p>11 expected, then that's more profit to the</p> <p>12 plan sponsor up to a 5% difference, what</p> <p>13 happens after that point?</p> <p>14 A. There is a sharing on a</p> <p>15 percentage basis of those differences</p> <p>16 between CMS and the plan sponsor and it</p> <p>17 depends on magnitude of the difference.</p> <p>18 So there are brackets. It's -- the</p> <p>19 greater the difference from the original</p> <p>20 budget, the greater the share that is</p> <p>21 allocated to CMS.</p> <p>22 Q. So essentially a Medicare Part</p> <p>23 D sponsor like Emblem or Summa would have</p> <p>24 to share its profits with CMS; is that</p> <p>25 right?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 105</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 paid for valsartan should somehow be</p> <p>3 adjusted or offset by any risk corridor</p> <p>4 payments either direction for literally</p> <p>5 tens of thousands of drugs made over the</p> <p>6 course of an entire year by a plan</p> <p>7 sponsor. I simply do not understand the</p> <p>8 logic for saying that that somehow alters</p> <p>9 the price that Emblem or Summa paid for</p> <p>10 those drugs.</p> <p>11 Q. Have you ever attempted to do</p> <p>12 any kind of tracing from price or the</p> <p>13 cost paid by Emblem or Summa for a</p> <p>14 particular prescription or a set of</p> <p>15 prescriptions to the subsidies received</p> <p>16 from CMS?</p> <p>17 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>18 form.</p> <p>19 A. No.</p> <p>20 Q. And so sitting here today,</p> <p>21 you're not sure whether or not it's even</p> <p>22 possible to trace an individual</p> <p>23 prescription price back to subsidies that</p> <p>24 Emblem or Summa may have received from</p> <p>25 CMS?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 106</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 A. I did not --</p> <p>3 MR. STANOCH: Objection --</p> <p>4 A. -- say that.</p> <p>5 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>6 form.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you believe it's possible</p> <p>8 to trace an individual prescription or a</p> <p>9 set of prescriptions -- strike that. Let</p> <p>10 me rephrase.</p> <p>11 Do you believe it's possible</p> <p>12 to trace the impact of a subsidy paid by</p> <p>13 CMS to Emblem or Summa down through a</p> <p>14 particular cost or price paid for a</p> <p>15 prescription?</p> <p>16 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>17 form.</p> <p>18 A. I need you to be specific</p> <p>19 about what subsidy you're talking about.</p> <p>20 That is a compound and very difficult</p> <p>21 question as is framed.</p> <p>22 Q. I'm asking for all subsidies</p> <p>23 right now.</p> <p>24 Do you have a general opinion</p> <p>25 about whether or not you can trace any</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 108</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 So let's start with that one.</p> <p>3 And once again, I want to add, you know,</p> <p>4 this is explicitly a substitute for</p> <p>5 premium from the member. But so it's like</p> <p>6 the plan has expected that its base drug</p> <p>7 experience -- and by base, I mean what is</p> <p>8 described as the out-of-pocket threshold</p> <p>9 -- is going to cost about X for all drugs</p> <p>10 regardless what the moving parts are in</p> <p>11 that.</p> <p>12 The subsidy on which I think</p> <p>13 Mr. Kosty placed -- places most weight is</p> <p>14 what's described as the reinsurance</p> <p>15 subsidy. And the name is telling. It's</p> <p>16 important to recognize what that is. It's</p> <p>17 reinsurance. It's recognizing that claims</p> <p>18 experience, in aggregate, for certain</p> <p>19 individuals is unusually high. Their</p> <p>20 medical needs have caused expenses for</p> <p>21 them to be above that out-of-pocket</p> <p>22 threshold. And what happens is that CMS</p> <p>23 steps in and contributes an amount that</p> <p>24 is designed to represent plan</p> <p>25 expenditures above for members in that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 107</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 particular subsidy amount from CMS to</p> <p>3 Emblem or Summa down through to the</p> <p>4 particular cost of price paid for a</p> <p>5 prescription?</p> <p>6 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>7 form, lacks foundation, vague and</p> <p>8 ambiguous. Go ahead. Incomplete</p> <p>9 hypothetical.</p> <p>10 A. Okay. I think you're asking me</p> <p>11 to break out the various subsidies and</p> <p>12 discuss them independently. And the</p> <p>13 direct subsidy, which is paid every month</p> <p>14 on a prospective basis, is never adjusted</p> <p>15 based on actual purchases. It is a number</p> <p>16 that is constructed in the bidding</p> <p>17 process based on historical experience</p> <p>18 and demographic characteristics of the</p> <p>19 population that's being insured by the</p> <p>20 particular plan and you don't get to</p> <p>21 jigger it based on what actually happens.</p> <p>22 So I would say that it is not traced to</p> <p>23 the actual -- a valsartan purchased by</p> <p>24 EmblemHealth during a particular plan</p> <p>25 year.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 109</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 catastrophic phase, i.e., whose purchases</p> <p>3 have exceeded the out-of-pocket</p> <p>4 threshold.</p> <p>5 The payments that are made by</p> <p>6 CMS in this phase are unquestionably</p> <p>7 calculated from and dependent upon the</p> <p>8 true and accurate reporting of the prices</p> <p>9 that were actually paid to pharmacies for</p> <p>10 those purchases.</p> <p>11 So yes, those subsidies are --</p> <p>12 the reinsurance subsidy is computed using</p> <p>13 actual price reporting for those</p> <p>14 transactions that -- those drugs that</p> <p>15 have been purchased above the</p> <p>16 out-of-pocket threshold during the plan</p> <p>17 year, and then formulas are applied that</p> <p>18 allocate a portion of those catastrophic</p> <p>19 phase expenditures to -- that identify a</p> <p>20 portion of those expenditures for which</p> <p>21 CMS will then pay the reinsurance subsidy</p> <p>22 to the plan sponsor.</p> <p>23 A portion of those</p> <p>24 expenditures are left with the plan</p> <p>25 sponsor, itself, and a portion, a small</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 110</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 portion is retained by the consumer as</p> <p>3 its co-pay during this coverage phase.</p> <p>4 Q. Ms. Craft, have you personally</p> <p>5 ever -- strike that.</p> <p>6 Would you consider yourself an</p> <p>7 expert in healthcare or actuary science?</p> <p>8 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>9 form.</p> <p>10 A. No.</p> <p>11 Q. The PBM data -- strike that.</p> <p>12 The data that you looked at</p> <p>13 from MSP from December of 2020 does not</p> <p>14 provide any information about subsidies</p> <p>15 that Emblem or Summa may have received,</p> <p>16 correct?</p> <p>17 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>18 form.</p> <p>19 A. One correction, I believe you</p> <p>20 referred just now to data received in</p> <p>21 2020 and I think you meant December 2022.</p> <p>22 Q. I did. Let me restart.</p> <p>23 The data that you looked at</p> <p>24 from MSP from December of 2022 does not</p> <p>25 provide any information about subsidies</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 112</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 regarding rebates provided, but I suspect</p> <p>3 there are also no rebates provided.</p> <p>4 When you say refunds, I don't</p> <p>5 know what you mean by refunds.</p> <p>6 Q. What does the word refund mean</p> <p>7 to you?</p> <p>8 A. It means different things in</p> <p>9 different contexts.</p> <p>10 So, for example, functionally</p> <p>11 we might think of refund as you get your</p> <p>12 money back and the truth is that</p> <p>13 pharmaceutical data generated by PBMs</p> <p>14 contains large numbers of claim</p> <p>15 reversals.</p> <p>16 A charge is recorded as</p> <p>17 payable, a transaction is going to have</p> <p>18 to result in money being transferred to</p> <p>19 the pharmacy. It is then subsequently</p> <p>20 reversed through an offsetting negative</p> <p>21 entry. I don't think that's a refund, but</p> <p>22 some might think of it as one because</p> <p>23 there is an electronic processing of a</p> <p>24 charge followed by an electronic</p> <p>25 processing of an exactly offsetting</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 111</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 that Emblem or Summa may have received,</p> <p>3 correct?</p> <p>4 MR. STANOCH: Objection.</p> <p>5 A. That's correct. Nor would it</p> <p>6 because these are an entirely separate</p> <p>7 set of funding transactions that do not</p> <p>8 play a part in the payments to the</p> <p>9 pharmacy that are reported in the PBM</p> <p>10 data.</p> <p>11 Q. Ms. Craft, the data that you</p> <p>12 reviewed from MSP from December of 2020</p> <p>13 also does not include any kind of</p> <p>14 information about rebates or refunds,</p> <p>15 correct?</p> <p>16 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>17 form.</p> <p>18 A. Yeah, I think you said 2020</p> <p>19 again, but I'm going to take it as 2022.</p> <p>20 And your question is, does it include</p> <p>21 data on rebates or refunds?</p> <p>22 So rebates are typically a</p> <p>23 product of branded drugs, not generic</p> <p>24 drugs, and this case involves generic</p> <p>25 drugs. It is true there is no data</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 113</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 transaction with negative values that is</p> <p>3 designed to wipe them out.</p> <p>4 If I went to the department</p> <p>5 store and used my credit card to make a</p> <p>6 purchase and turned around before I got</p> <p>7 to my car and decided to take the</p> <p>8 merchandise back, there would be a very</p> <p>9 similar set of positive and negative</p> <p>10 offsetting transactions. The store would</p> <p>11 probably tell me there's your refund</p> <p>12 being shown on your card. I don't think</p> <p>13 those are refunds, but they could,</p> <p>14 depending on how you are defining the</p> <p>15 term, I suppose one might use that</p> <p>16 construction.</p> <p>17 Q. In the MSP data that you</p> <p>18 reviewed from December of 2022 did you</p> <p>19 see any reversals?</p> <p>20 A. No, for the very reason that</p> <p>21 when the PBM supply data to their TPP</p> <p>22 clients, they typically report only what</p> <p>23 are called final paid claims, which is to</p> <p>24 say, the ones that didn't get reversed. I</p> <p>25 mention this because reversals are very</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 114</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 common. You know, they may constitute 20,</p> <p>3 25% of the rows of data that you see in</p> <p>4 PBM processing records and that's simply</p> <p>5 because if there is something that's</p> <p>6 erroneous, that doesn't connect with the</p> <p>7 particular plan structure that has to be</p> <p>8 corrected, the transaction is then</p> <p>9 reversed or cancelled and it typically is</p> <p>10 then reprocessed correctly.</p> <p>11 Q. So no, in the MSP data you</p> <p>12 reviewed from December of 2022 you didn't</p> <p>13 see any reversals?</p> <p>14 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>15 form. Go ahead.</p> <p>16 A. No, nor would I expect to.</p> <p>17 Q. If we use the word refund in</p> <p>18 the sense of someone buys a prescription</p> <p>19 and they want to take it back for that</p> <p>20 prescription from a pharmacy, did you see</p> <p>21 any of those kinds of refunds in the MSP</p> <p>22 data from December of 2022?</p> <p>23 A. No, I did not.</p> <p>24 Q. Do you know how generally a</p> <p>25 PBM would track those kinds of refunds?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 116</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 form.</p> <p>3 A. I can't provide you with a</p> <p>4 good estimate. I can tell you it</p> <p>5 certainly exceeds a hundred but I don't</p> <p>6 know how many more than that.</p> <p>7 Q. Have you ever drafted a</p> <p>8 contract between a PBM and a third-party</p> <p>9 payor?</p> <p>10 A. No.</p> <p>11 Q. Have you ever been able to --</p> <p>12 strike that.</p> <p>13 Have you ever been asked to</p> <p>14 review a contract between a PBM and a</p> <p>15 third-party payor in your capacity as an</p> <p>16 attorney?</p> <p>17 A. No. I should make clear, I</p> <p>18 don't practice as an attorney.</p> <p>19 Q. Looking at paragraph 23 from</p> <p>20 your report you state that, "The</p> <p>21 provision of these contracts are also</p> <p>22 consistent with the general practices of</p> <p>23 using only one PBM at a time often for</p> <p>24 many years." Do you see that?</p> <p>25 A. I do.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 115</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>3 form.</p> <p>4 A. Those kinds of refunds,</p> <p>5 meaning a consumer brings the drug</p> <p>6 product they purchased back to the</p> <p>7 pharmacy and asks for their money back?</p> <p>8 Q. Correct.</p> <p>9 A. No, I do not.</p> <p>10 Q. Ms. Craft, your report states</p> <p>11 that you've reviewed the contracts</p> <p>12 between Emblem and Express Scripts and</p> <p>13 SummaCare and MedImpact, correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Just to confirm, you're not</p> <p>16 offering any legal opinions about those</p> <p>17 contracts, correct?</p> <p>18 A. That's right. I'm not offering</p> <p>19 legal opinions about anything.</p> <p>20 Q. Did you estimate about how</p> <p>21 many contracts between PBMs and</p> <p>22 third-party payors like Summa and Emblem</p> <p>23 you've reviewed in the course of your</p> <p>24 career?</p> <p>25 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 117</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Q. And is that opinion based on</p> <p>3 your industry experience or something</p> <p>4 else?</p> <p>5 A. It's based on my industry</p> <p>6 experience, my review of contracts, my</p> <p>7 understanding about why and how it's</p> <p>8 efficient to use a single PBM.</p> <p>9 It would be a considerably</p> <p>10 less efficient process if a given plan</p> <p>11 sponsor which would divide up its claims</p> <p>12 activity between two PBMs. You could do</p> <p>13 it based on line of business, for</p> <p>14 example, your Medicare business with one</p> <p>15 PBM, your commercial business with</p> <p>16 another, but the efficiencies all arise</p> <p>17 around combining that work with a given</p> <p>18 PBM. It allows the PBMs to generate</p> <p>19 analytic reports across all plans and</p> <p>20 otherwise to provide a broader range of</p> <p>21 services.</p> <p>22 Q. And in your experience, how</p> <p>23 often do payors use just one PBM --</p> <p>24 strike that.</p> <p>25 In your experience what</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 118</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 percentage of payors use just one PBM?</p> <p>3 A. And can you define "payor" for</p> <p>4 me here?</p> <p>5 Q. Sure.</p> <p>6 A. Do you mean a plan sponsor or</p> <p>7 do you mean a large insurance company</p> <p>8 that has many plans that it's sponsoring?</p> <p>9 What concept are you trying to get at</p> <p>10 here?</p> <p>11 Q. Let's go with health plan</p> <p>12 sponsor.</p> <p>13 In your experience, how often</p> <p>14 do sponsors, like Summa and Emblem, use</p> <p>15 just one PBM?</p> <p>16 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>17 form.</p> <p>18 A. So the distinction I'm trying</p> <p>19 to make here that for a single health</p> <p>20 plan I have never seen and cannot</p> <p>21 conceive of a sponsor using more than one</p> <p>22 PBM. So my answer would be always one,</p> <p>23 never more at a point in time, at a point</p> <p>24 in time. I should be clear.</p> <p>25 Q. And if we use the word payor</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 120</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 designated vendor, with such tape to be</p> <p>3 formatted in the standard NCPDP claims</p> <p>4 file format or in a mutually agreed upon</p> <p>5 format." Do you see that?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Is claims tape the same as</p> <p>8 claims data?</p> <p>9 A. No. Tape refers to the medium</p> <p>10 on which the data is delivered, not to</p> <p>11 the nature of the data itself. The tape</p> <p>12 is just talking about how that's</p> <p>13 delivered.</p> <p>14 Q. And when it says "tapes" does</p> <p>15 it mean literally like an old school</p> <p>16 tape?</p> <p>17 A. I don't know. I'd have to go</p> <p>18 back and look at the contract to see if</p> <p>19 there is further explanation.</p> <p>20 What this means substantively</p> <p>21 in terms of what's being delivered is the</p> <p>22 claims data is -- the individualized</p> <p>23 claims data is being delivered by the PBM</p> <p>24 to -- the PBM MedImpact to SummaCare.</p> <p>25 Q. And the last clause is about</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 119</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 to mean a large insurance company that</p> <p>3 has many plans, how often do those large</p> <p>4 insurance companies with many plans use</p> <p>5 just one PBM at any given time?</p> <p>6 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>7 form.</p> <p>8 A. It's the general rule. But as</p> <p>9 I mentioned a moment ago, in some cases a</p> <p>10 large insurer might conceivably use one</p> <p>11 PBM, for example, for its Medicare Part D</p> <p>12 business and another for its other, for</p> <p>13 its other standard commercial business.</p> <p>14 There could be a split like that on a</p> <p>15 line of business basis.</p> <p>16 In general, insurers use one</p> <p>17 PBM across their line of business, but</p> <p>18 it's not invariably the case. You could</p> <p>19 have a split of the type I just</p> <p>20 described.</p> <p>21 Q. Looking at paragraph 24 of</p> <p>22 your report you state that, "The</p> <p>23 EmblemHealth contract requires Express</p> <p>24 Scripts to deliver a formatted paid</p> <p>25 claims tape to client, EmblemHealth, or a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 121</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 being either a NCPDP or a mutually agreed</p> <p>3 upon format.</p> <p>4 Do you know whether the claims</p> <p>5 data from Express Scripts for</p> <p>6 EmblemHealth is a NCPDP format or in some</p> <p>7 other format?</p> <p>8 A. So it certainly conforms to</p> <p>9 NCPDP standards for the fields that I</p> <p>10 reviewed in the MSP production and which</p> <p>11 are germane to the calculation of damages</p> <p>12 in this case. I can't speak to any other</p> <p>13 fields that I haven't examined.</p> <p>14 I do want to correct my last</p> <p>15 answer. The quote you were reading to me</p> <p>16 had to do with Emblem, Emblem's contract</p> <p>17 with Express Scripts not SummaCare. So if</p> <p>18 you substitute the word Emblem for</p> <p>19 SummaCare in my last answer, that would</p> <p>20 be correct.</p> <p>21 Q. Ms. Craft, I want to look at</p> <p>22 some of the contracts between the TPP --</p> <p>23 or the MSP TPPs and their PBMs that you</p> <p>24 refer to in your report.</p> <p>25 A. Okay.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 122</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Q. Can we pull up tab 5, please,</p> <p>3 which I think is going to be Exhibit 5?</p> <p>4 (Exhibit 5, Express Scripts</p> <p>5 PBM Agreement, Bates</p> <p>6 MSP-EMBLEM-000445 was received and</p> <p>7 marked on this date for</p> <p>8 identification.)</p> <p>9 Q. Just let me know when you've</p> <p>10 got it, Ms. Craft.</p> <p>11 A. Okay. I have that document up.</p> <p>12 Q. For the record, Exhibit 5 is</p> <p>13 Bates stamped MSP-EMBLEM-000445.</p> <p>14 Ms. Craft, do you recognize</p> <p>15 this as one of the contracts that you</p> <p>16 reviewed in putting together your report?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>18 Q. If we look at footnote 7 in</p> <p>19 your report, which I believe is on page</p> <p>20 4., do you see that this footnote says</p> <p>21 "The agreements between EmblemHealth and</p> <p>22 SummaCare and their respective PBMs</p> <p>23 include automatic renewal at the end of</p> <p>24 the contract", and then cites to a number</p> <p>25 of contracts, right?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 124</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 questions earlier this morning, a</p> <p>3 subsidiary of Emblem, I probably should</p> <p>4 have said more correctly in my report</p> <p>5 that this was a contract entered into</p> <p>6 with HIP and ConnectiCare rather than</p> <p>7 identifying it to Emblem.</p> <p>8 The provisions that I describe</p> <p>9 in my report from these two contracts</p> <p>10 that are cited are there merely to</p> <p>11 explain that there was nothing unusual</p> <p>12 about these PBM relationships. They look</p> <p>13 just like they ordinarily do in this</p> <p>14 industry. And that's the place I'm</p> <p>15 referring to them, automatic renewals,</p> <p>16 long-term relationships, agreements to</p> <p>17 provide data to the plan sponsors,</p> <p>18 reflecting each of the individual claims</p> <p>19 and so on.</p> <p>20 MR. STANOCH: For the record,</p> <p>21 THE footnote 7 that counsel was</p> <p>22 asking about moments earlier does</p> <p>23 say -- identify -- it says, "The</p> <p>24 agreement between Express Scripts,</p> <p>25 Health Insurance Plan of Greater</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 123</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 A. I do see that.</p> <p>3 Q. And this EMBLEM-445 document</p> <p>4 that we're looking at in Exhibit 5 is one</p> <p>5 of those, correct?</p> <p>6 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>7 Q. All right. So looking back at</p> <p>8 Exhibit 5, the contract, itself, do you</p> <p>9 see that in the preamble, the first</p> <p>10 paragraph, it says that this contract is</p> <p>11 entered into by and between Express</p> <p>12 Scripts and Health Insurance Plan of</p> <p>13 Greater New York, ConnectiCare and HIP</p> <p>14 Insurance Company of New York?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. It does not list EmblemHealth</p> <p>17 there, correct?</p> <p>18 A. You are correct, I don't see</p> <p>19 the name Emblem Healthcare there.</p> <p>20 Q. So are you able to tell me how</p> <p>21 this particular contract between HIPIC</p> <p>22 and ConnectiCare relates to Emblem?</p> <p>23 A. So I was aware at the time of</p> <p>24 drafting my report that ConnectiCare was</p> <p>25 affiliated, or as you said in your</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 125</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 New York, ConnectiCare and HIP</p> <p>3 Insurance Company of New York</p> <p>4 effective January 1, 2017 through</p> <p>5 December 31, 2019."</p> <p>6 Q. Ms. Craft, how does this</p> <p>7 contract at tab 5 bind Emblem?</p> <p>8 MR. STANOCH: Counsel, are you</p> <p>9 representing that Emblem is not</p> <p>10 HIP?</p> <p>11 MS. BRANCATO: I'm trying to</p> <p>12 understand if this contract is</p> <p>13 supposed to be between Emblem and</p> <p>14 Express Scripts or at least bind</p> <p>15 Emblem to a PBM agreement with</p> <p>16 Express Scripts, what is the</p> <p>17 relationship between Express</p> <p>18 Scripts, ConnectiCare, HIP, HIPIC</p> <p>19 and all these other entities, and</p> <p>20 if Ms. Craft understands that.</p> <p>21 MR. STANOCH: Restate your</p> <p>22 question.</p> <p>23 Q. Ms. Craft, do you understand</p> <p>24 one way or another whether Emblem is also</p> <p>25 known as HIP?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 126</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 A. I do not.</p> <p>3 Q. And are you aware, one way or</p> <p>4 another, of how this particular contract</p> <p>5 in Exhibit 5 binds Emblem to an PBM</p> <p>6 agreement with Express Scripts?</p> <p>7 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>8 form.</p> <p>9 A. No, but I can assure you it</p> <p>10 contains standard provisions which make</p> <p>11 exactly the points that I've described in</p> <p>12 my report, about the relationship between</p> <p>13 the PBM and a plan sponsor.</p> <p>14 Q. I understand that. And we're</p> <p>15 going to get to the provisions in a</p> <p>16 minute. I'm just trying to make sure</p> <p>17 we're all on the same page about who</p> <p>18 those contracts are for.</p> <p>19 So are you aware of any</p> <p>20 contract directly between Express Scripts</p> <p>21 where it says this contract is between</p> <p>22 Express Scripts and EmblemHealth?</p> <p>23 MR. STANOCH: Objection and</p> <p>24 mischaracterizes the record.</p> <p>25 Again, you're misstating and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 128</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 that this is titled Pharmacy</p> <p>3 Reimbursement Rates?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. And this page says "redacted",</p> <p>6 correct?</p> <p>7 A. That's correct. It says</p> <p>8 redacted.</p> <p>9 Q. And was this redaction applied</p> <p>10 before it was provided to you? Let me</p> <p>11 strike that.</p> <p>12 When this document was</p> <p>13 provided to you was it already redacted?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Do you know who redacted it?</p> <p>16 A. No.</p> <p>17 Q. In your experience, would</p> <p>18 Exhibit 1-A be a list of pharmacy</p> <p>19 reimbursement rates for specific drug</p> <p>20 products?</p> <p>21 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>22 form. Go ahead, if you can.</p> <p>23 A. Generally it would describe</p> <p>24 pharmacy reimbursement rates by category</p> <p>25 as opposed to by individual product and</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 127</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 misrepresenting the relationship</p> <p>3 and entity names of the entities</p> <p>4 reflected in the agreement.</p> <p>5 You can answer if you'd like</p> <p>6 or if you can.</p> <p>7 A. Well, I would simply say that</p> <p>8 the contracts that I've cited in my</p> <p>9 report are the PBM contracts that I have</p> <p>10 seen in this matter. They are the ones</p> <p>11 that were provided to me. So if you are</p> <p>12 asking me; do I have some other different</p> <p>13 ones, the answer is no.</p> <p>14 Q. Can we go to page 29 of</p> <p>15 Exhibit 5 -- sorry -- it's 29 of the pdf,</p> <p>16 Justin, and 27 of the actual document.</p> <p>17 Ms. Craft, just let me know</p> <p>18 when you're there.</p> <p>19 A. Yes, I'm there.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you see that this is marked</p> <p>21 Exhibit A at the top and it lists some</p> <p>22 sub-exhibits under Exhibit A?</p> <p>23 A. Yes, I do see that.</p> <p>24 Q. So if we flip to the next</p> <p>25 page, which is Exhibit A-1, do you see</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 129</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 it would prescribe the procedure by which</p> <p>3 those rates are to be determined at the</p> <p>4 time a transaction takes place.</p> <p>5 For example, will they be</p> <p>6 based upon MAC, maximum allow cost rates</p> <p>7 set by the PBM or will they, in the case</p> <p>8 of brand, possibly be set using the</p> <p>9 average wholesale price with a specified</p> <p>10 discount, under what circumstances will</p> <p>11 drugs be reimbursed to the pharmacy at</p> <p>12 the pharmacy's own usual and customary</p> <p>13 rate and that sort of thing.</p> <p>14 I would not expect to see a</p> <p>15 list of specific dollar amount prices for</p> <p>16 individual drugs here. Those prices</p> <p>17 typically are adjusted throughout the</p> <p>18 year under pharmacy reimbursement</p> <p>19 contracts using one of the benchmarks I</p> <p>20 just described, which is to say, either</p> <p>21 it's a MAC price or an AWP price. So it</p> <p>22 is not normally the case that one can fix</p> <p>23 the dollar amount in a contract of this</p> <p>24 sort.</p> <p>25 However, it's very standard</p>


<p style="text-align: right;">Page 130</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 for PBMs to want these terms redacted</p> <p>3 when they -- when their contracts are</p> <p>4 produced because it's proprietary</p> <p>5 information about how they set their</p> <p>6 pharmacy price.</p> <p>7 Q. If are there other redactions</p> <p>8 applied throughout this document, is it</p> <p>9 safe to assume you didn't apply any of</p> <p>10 those?</p> <p>11 A. That is correct. I did not</p> <p>12 alter the document in any way.</p> <p>13 Q. And you're not offering an</p> <p>14 opinion about whether the document is</p> <p>15 properly redacted based on proprietary or</p> <p>16 not proprietary information, correct?</p> <p>17 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>18 form. The document was produced in</p> <p>19 this litigation pursuant to an</p> <p>20 agreed upon Protective Order</p> <p>21 negotiated with defendants at their</p> <p>22 insistence on additional provisions</p> <p>23 over the original Protective Order.</p> <p>24 And one of the counterparties to</p> <p>25 this agreement, Express Scripts, is</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 132</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 meant is obviously a defendant in</p> <p>3 the overall multidistrict</p> <p>4 litigation.</p> <p>5 MS. BRANCATO: I'm only asking</p> <p>6 about proprietary information</p> <p>7 because Ms. Craft mentioned it. And</p> <p>8 so I just want to make sure she's</p> <p>9 not going to come to trial and talk</p> <p>10 about whether something is or isn't</p> <p>11 proprietary to Express Scripts or</p> <p>12 anybody else.</p> <p>13 MR. STANOCH: Why don't you</p> <p>14 ask your question, Ms. Craft?</p> <p>15 Q. Ms. Craft, sitting here today,</p> <p>16 are you offering an opinion about whether</p> <p>17 or not the information in Exhibit 5 is</p> <p>18 proprietary to anyone?</p> <p>19 MR. STANOCH: Same objections.</p> <p>20 A. Well, I shouldn't use the word</p> <p>21 "proprietary". What I meant is this is</p> <p>22 routinely considered to be sensitive and</p> <p>23 confidential information by PBMs.</p> <p>24 And let me, again, stress that</p> <p>25 in my answer to your question; wouldn't</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 131</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 a party defendant and represented</p> <p>3 on this call right now by</p> <p>4 Mr. Knepper.</p> <p>5 So objection. And I -- I take</p> <p>6 issue with the insinuations about</p> <p>7 who did what redactions and how it</p> <p>8 was redacted in this case.</p> <p>9 MS. BRANCATO: I'm entitled to</p> <p>10 ask the expert if she redacted this</p> <p>11 or if it was received by her in</p> <p>12 this form.</p> <p>13 MR. KNEPPER: Wait. This is</p> <p>14 Matt Knepper. I just want to</p> <p>15 clarify I am on this call.</p> <p>16 Express Scripts is not a</p> <p>17 defendant to the third-party payor</p> <p>18 cases. So, Mr. Stanoch, I don't</p> <p>19 know if you meant it that way, but</p> <p>20 I just wanted to clarify that for</p> <p>21 the record so everyone is clear.</p> <p>22 MR. STANOCH: I agree,</p> <p>23 Mr. Knepper, that your client is</p> <p>24 not a defendant as to the</p> <p>25 third-party payors. Your client I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 133</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 you see lists of prices here, my answer</p> <p>3 was no. And that I don't understand this</p> <p>4 field would have any relevance whatsoever</p> <p>5 to this litigation.</p> <p>6 It talks about, ordinarily</p> <p>7 this exhibit would discuss the methods by</p> <p>8 which pharmacy reimbursement prices will</p> <p>9 be determined, and that has absolutely</p> <p>10 nothing to do with the issue here, which</p> <p>11 is, okay, what amount were they actually</p> <p>12 paying? And we don't have to wonder about</p> <p>13 that. We don't need Exhibit A-1 to tell</p> <p>14 us that. The data tells us for every</p> <p>15 prescription what they were paid.</p> <p>16 So I don't understand the --</p> <p>17 why the pricing methodology with which</p> <p>18 Express Scripts negotiated those prices</p> <p>19 would have anything whatsoever to do with</p> <p>20 this case.</p> <p>21 Q. Ms. Craft, I'm asking</p> <p>22 questions about the document because you</p> <p>23 cited it in your report and I just want</p> <p>24 to make sure that you and I are on the</p> <p>25 same page about what's actually in this</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 134</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 contract.</p> <p>3 I understand your position</p> <p>4 that what's in this contract, the pricing</p> <p>5 terms are irrelevant to the bottom line</p> <p>6 that was paid by Emblem and SummaCare,</p> <p>7 but that isn't what I'm focused on right</p> <p>8 now.</p> <p>9 MR. STANOCH: Is there a</p> <p>10 question?</p> <p>11 MS. BRANCATO: Not yet.</p> <p>12 MR. STANOCH: Okay. Just</p> <p>13 making sure. Objection to the</p> <p>14 statement without a question.</p> <p>15 Q. Let's look at tab 6, please</p> <p>16 which we're going to mark as Exhibit 6.</p> <p>17 For the record, this Bates stamped</p> <p>18 MSP-EMBLEM-0000541.</p> <p>19 (Exhibit 6, Express Scripts</p> <p>20 Senior Care MPS agreement, Bates</p> <p>21 MSP-EMBLEM-0000541 was received and</p> <p>22 marked on this date for</p> <p>23 identification.)</p> <p>24 Q. Ms. Craft, do you recognize</p> <p>25 this document as something you reviewed</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 136</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Q. So there aren't any contracts</p> <p>3 missing that you had meant to include in</p> <p>4 your materials relied upon that</p> <p>5 accidentally included multiples of this; is</p> <p>6 that right?</p> <p>7 MR. STANOCH: Same objection.</p> <p>8 Objection.</p> <p>9 A. Not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>10 Q. We can take that down.</p> <p>11 Let's look at paragraph 26 of</p> <p>12 your report.</p> <p>13 Do you see that you mention</p> <p>14 that Express Scripts processes</p> <p>15 approximately 23% of U.S. prescriptions</p> <p>16 in 2018?</p> <p>17 A. I do see that.</p> <p>18 Q. Is that 23% specific to</p> <p>19 valsartan prescriptions?</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 Q. And later on in that same</p> <p>22 paragraph you mention that MedImpact is</p> <p>23 smaller but is the primary processor for</p> <p>24 approximately 2.87 of VCD purchases. Do</p> <p>25 you see that?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 135</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 in putting together your report?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. If we look at page 33 of the</p> <p>5 pdf do you see the signature pages here?</p> <p>6 A. I do.</p> <p>7 Q. Ms. Craft, are you aware of</p> <p>8 whether or not Exhibit 6 is a duplicate</p> <p>9 of other contracts listed in your</p> <p>10 materials relied upon?</p> <p>11 A. You are asking whether this</p> <p>12 contract appears more than once listed in</p> <p>13 my materials relied upon?</p> <p>14 Q. Yes. Do you know that?</p> <p>15 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>16 Q. If this same contract is, in</p> <p>17 fact, at three different Bate stamps on</p> <p>18 your materials relied upon list, would</p> <p>19 that have been a mistake?</p> <p>20 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>21 form.</p> <p>22 A. No. No. It might have been</p> <p>23 overinclusive, perhaps a little more</p> <p>24 thorough than was warranted, but it's not</p> <p>25 a mistake.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 137</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. When you say "primary</p> <p>4 processor", what do you mean?</p> <p>5 A. I mean it's the first</p> <p>6 processor in the sequence. A claim may be</p> <p>7 processed by multiple entities because</p> <p>8 you may have multiple payors on a single</p> <p>9 purchase and the primary is the place the</p> <p>10 data goes first through processing.</p> <p>11 So Xponent lists -- the</p> <p>12 Xponent product supplied by IQVIA lists</p> <p>13 the first processor when it identifies</p> <p>14 PBM or processor. And this statement is</p> <p>15 derived from the Xponent data, which was</p> <p>16 supplied in this case and simply reports</p> <p>17 the share of those transactions that in</p> <p>18 the Xponent data are linked to the name</p> <p>19 MedImpact as the processor or PBM.</p> <p>20 Q. And how did you decide on the</p> <p>21 time period from January 2012 to October</p> <p>22 of 2020?</p> <p>23 A. I honestly don't recall if</p> <p>24 that was the scope of the data that was</p> <p>25 supplied by IQVIA in the Xponent reports.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 138</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 That may be the date range in the data. I</p> <p>3 don't recall.</p> <p>4 Q. In paragraph 26 the conclusion</p> <p>5 is that there is no reason to question</p> <p>6 the accuracy of the claims data supplied</p> <p>7 to Emblem or Summa by their PBMs. Do you</p> <p>8 see that?</p> <p>9 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>10 Q. Did you do an analysis of the</p> <p>11 accuracy of the claims data supplied to</p> <p>12 Emblem and Summa by their PBMs?</p> <p>13 A. I certainly reviewed the</p> <p>14 fields to see that the values reported</p> <p>15 appeared to be complete and to represent</p> <p>16 the elements that are routinely reported</p> <p>17 throughout this industry. I don't know</p> <p>18 what you would expect anyone to do to try</p> <p>19 to find an error in the PBM data.</p> <p>20 Such errors would be extremely</p> <p>21 improbable, and, no, I did not attempt to</p> <p>22 audit these records. But you have chosen</p> <p>23 not to highlight the last part of that</p> <p>24 sentence, which is the key.</p> <p>25 Everybody in the industry goes</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 140</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 data.</p> <p>3 Q. You haven't undertaken any</p> <p>4 exercise to verify whether or not there</p> <p>5 are any inaccuracies or misstatements of</p> <p>6 the PBM claims data for EmblemHealth or</p> <p>7 SummaCare, correct?</p> <p>8 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>9 form.</p> <p>10 A. I have not.</p> <p>11 Q. Ms. Craft, let's look at</p> <p>12 paragraph 27 of your report, please.</p> <p>13 A. Okay. I'm there.</p> <p>14 Q. You note here that</p> <p>15 EmblemHealth has assigned claims during</p> <p>16 the six-year period beginning September</p> <p>17 29th, 2011 and ending September 29th,</p> <p>18 2017, correct?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. And SummaCare has assigned</p> <p>21 claims between January 1st, 2009 and May</p> <p>22 12th, 2017, correct?</p> <p>23 A. Yes. They may have assigned</p> <p>24 additional claims. I'm saying the</p> <p>25 documents I saw specifically identified</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 139</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 back to the PBM data as the source of the</p> <p>3 authoritative transaction reporting. And</p> <p>4 I note that Mr. Kosty, himself, does not</p> <p>5 contest that fact or challenge the</p> <p>6 accuracy the PBM data in his report.</p> <p>7 This is how the entire industry operates.</p> <p>8 Q. Ms. Craft, you testified</p> <p>9 earlier about a case that you are</p> <p>10 currently retained in against Caremark</p> <p>11 related to their misrepresentation or</p> <p>12 causing others to misrepresent inaccurate</p> <p>13 or inaccurately reporting the PBM data.</p> <p>14 A. Through CMS. That's not what</p> <p>15 this is. You understand the data we're</p> <p>16 talking about here, I've given you a</p> <p>17 lengthy explanation for why I think CMS</p> <p>18 reporting is not relevant to this case</p> <p>19 and to the exercise that's being</p> <p>20 undertaken here.</p> <p>21 What I'm talking about in this</p> <p>22 paragraph is PBM claims data, and that</p> <p>23 PBM claims data is a separate dataset and</p> <p>24 it is that which is described here in</p> <p>25 paragraph 26. It is not CMS reporting</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 141</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 those date ranges.</p> <p>3 Q. And your point that they may</p> <p>4 have assigned additional claims is what</p> <p>5 I'd like to talk about.</p> <p>6 A. Okay.</p> <p>7 Q. Sitting here today, have you</p> <p>8 seen any assignment of claims from</p> <p>9 SummaCare or Emblem more recent than</p> <p>10 2017?</p> <p>11 A. If what you mean is have I</p> <p>12 seen an assignment that governs</p> <p>13 specifically claims incurred later than</p> <p>14 2017? No, I have not seen such a</p> <p>15 document. I am aware that data was, in</p> <p>16 fact, produced by MSP covering claims</p> <p>17 experienced after 2017.</p> <p>18 Q. But you're not aware of</p> <p>19 whether SummaCare and Emblem have</p> <p>20 formally assigned claims occurring after</p> <p>21 2017 to MSP, correct?</p> <p>22 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>23 form.</p> <p>24 A. I haven't seen such an</p> <p>25 assignment but I do see that MSP has, and</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 142</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 has produced in this litigation, the data</p> <p>3 pertaining to such claims. I am not sure</p> <p>4 why it would have that data if they were</p> <p>5 not assigned.</p> <p>6 Q. So in paragraph 27 you say "it</p> <p>7 is my understanding that there may be</p> <p>8 additional assignments that extend that</p> <p>9 period." Do you see that?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. And is that statement based on</p> <p>12 the fact that MSP did produce data for</p> <p>13 claims beyond 2017?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. It's not based on any other</p> <p>16 assumptions or representations from</p> <p>17 counsel?</p> <p>18 A. No.</p> <p>19 Q. The very last sentence of that</p> <p>20 paragraph says, "As explained above, this</p> <p>21 data includes information sufficient", do</p> <p>22 you see that?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And I just want to triple</p> <p>25 check. When you say "this data" you mean</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 144</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 cost and dispensing fee components.</p> <p>3 Q. And that's the specific data</p> <p>4 that enables you to calculate it more</p> <p>5 precisely; is that right?</p> <p>6 A. So I don't know what the</p> <p>7 damage methodology will be in this case.</p> <p>8 Whether, for example, the dispensing fee</p> <p>9 will be part of the damage claim or not,</p> <p>10 that's not up to me. I'm not expressing</p> <p>11 opinions about damages.</p> <p>12 What I'm saying is that the</p> <p>13 more recent data production, should it be</p> <p>14 relevant, enables one to separate out the</p> <p>15 dispensing fee.</p> <p>16 MS. BRANCATO: Okay. We've been</p> <p>17 going almost another hour and a</p> <p>18 half. Why don't we take another</p> <p>19 break?</p> <p>20 VIDEOGRAPHER: Time is 11:25.</p> <p>21 This ends Media Unit 2. We're going</p> <p>22 off the record.</p> <p>23 (Recess is taken.)</p> <p>24 VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is</p> <p>25 11:40. This begins Media Unit 3.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 143</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 the data that MSP produced in December of</p> <p>3 2022, correct?</p> <p>4 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>5 form.</p> <p>6 A. It wasn't what I meant when I</p> <p>7 wrote this because this was written</p> <p>8 before December 2022, but it is now.</p> <p>9 Q. And when you wrote this</p> <p>10 originally in October of 2021, that</p> <p>11 opinion was based on the data that MSP</p> <p>12 had produced previously with fewer</p> <p>13 fields, correct?</p> <p>14 A. That's correct.</p> <p>15 Q. So is it your opinion that</p> <p>16 even with fewer fields in the MSP data we</p> <p>17 can still calculate the cost of the</p> <p>18 potential damages to Emblem and</p> <p>19 SummaCare?</p> <p>20 MR. STANOCH: Objection to</p> <p>21 form.</p> <p>22 A. Yes, but we can calculate it</p> <p>23 more precisely now, because rather than</p> <p>24 just having the amount that the plan</p> <p>25 paid, it's broken out into its ingredient</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 145</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 We're back on the record.</p> <p>3 Q. Ms. Craft, have you ever</p> <p>4 worked for a Medicare Part D sponsor,</p> <p>5 like Summa or Emblem?</p> <p>6 A. By "worked for", do you mean</p> <p>7 an employee of?</p> <p>8 Q. Yes.</p> <p>9 A. No.</p> <p>10 Q. And have you ever helped</p> <p>11 prepare a CMS bid on behalf of a Medicare</p> <p>12 Part D sponsor?</p> <p>13 A. I'm sorry. Have I ever helped</p> <p>14 prepare a CMS on behalf of a Medicare</p> <p>15 Part D sponsor?</p> <p>16 Q. A CMS bid.</p> <p>17 A. Oh, a bid. No.</p> <p>18 Q. And have you ever reviewed the</p> <p>19 legislative history surrounding Medicare</p> <p>20 Part D?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And when was the last time you</p> <p>23 reviewed it?</p> <p>24 A. The last time? I mean, it's</p> <p>25 something with which I'm generally</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 146</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 familiar in my work, that I have paid</p> <p>3 attention to and studied in the course of</p> <p>4 my graduate education about healthcare</p> <p>5 finance. The last time I looked at a</p> <p>6 Medicare Part D reg was probably weeks</p> <p>7 ago, or legislative history for a</p> <p>8 Medicare Part D reg.</p> <p>9 Q. So the last time you looked at</p> <p>10 the legislative history for a particular</p> <p>11 piece of a Medicare Part D regulation was</p> <p>12 a few weeks ago?</p> <p>13 A. Yes, that's probably right.</p> <p>14 Q. And have you ever submitted an</p> <p>15 expert report on the legislative history</p> <p>16 of Medicare Part D?</p> <p>17 A. No, not a report specific to</p> <p>18 legislative history.</p> <p>19 Q. Have you ever submitted an</p> <p>20 expert report on the purpose of Medicare</p> <p>21 Part D?</p> <p>22 A. Not specifically, no, no. I</p> <p>23 think the answer is no.</p> <p>24 MS. BRANCATO: Okay. Ms.</p> <p>25 Craft, I have no further questions</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 148</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 GHI and HIPIC Renamed EmblemHealth,</p> <p>3 dated June 15, 2021 was received</p> <p>4 and marked on this date for</p> <p>5 identification.)</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. And I'd like to share my</p> <p>7 screen. We'll mark it as an exhibit</p> <p>8 afterwards.</p> <p>9 Can you see my screen, Ms.</p> <p>10 Craft?</p> <p>11 A. Yes, I can. Thank you.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. And what is the title of</p> <p>13 this?</p> <p>14 A. GHI and HIPIC, H-I-P-I-C,</p> <p>15 renamed EmblemHealth, and it's dated June</p> <p>16 15, 2021.</p> <p>17 Q. Could you take a moment to</p> <p>18 read this? And I can scroll down as</p> <p>19 necessary. It's not that long. Tell me</p> <p>20 when you're done.</p> <p>21 A. Okay. I've read everything on</p> <p>22 the screen.</p> <p>23 Q. Have you had a chance to</p> <p>24 review this exhibit?</p> <p>25 A. I have.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 147</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 at this time subject to other</p> <p>3 questions that other defense</p> <p>4 counsel may have.</p> <p>5 MR. STANOCH: Any other</p> <p>6 defendants?</p> <p>7 MS. BRANCATO: Going once.</p> <p>8 MR. STANOCH: Hearing nothing,</p> <p>9 I've got a brief redirect.</p> <p>10 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STANOCH:</p> <p>11 Q. Hello, Ms. Craft. How are</p> <p>12 you?</p> <p>13 A. Fine. Thank you.</p> <p>14 Q. Do you recall questions</p> <p>15 earlier by Ms. Brancato about Exhibits, I</p> <p>16 believe, 5 and 6, which were PBM</p> <p>17 contracts with certain entities related</p> <p>18 to EmblemHealth?</p> <p>19 A. I do.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. And are you aware,</p> <p>21 generally, that from time to time</p> <p>22 corporate entities may effectuate a name</p> <p>23 change?</p> <p>24 A. Yes, it does happen.</p> <p>25 (Exhibit 7, document entitled</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 149</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 Q. And what is this exhibit</p> <p>3 saying about the renaming of Group Health</p> <p>4 Incorporated and HIP Insurance Company of</p> <p>5 New York?</p> <p>6 A. That both of them are being or</p> <p>7 have been renamed as EmblemHealth.</p> <p>8 In the former case, GHI, as</p> <p>9 EmblemHealth Plan, Inc., and in the</p> <p>10 latter, HIP or HIPIC, has been renamed</p> <p>11 Emblem Health Insurance Company.</p> <p>12 Q. And this document you noted is</p> <p>13 dated from June of 2021?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. All right. Do you recall</p> <p>16 whether that is after the date of the two</p> <p>17 PBM contracts that we looked at earlier?</p> <p>18 A. Oh, yes, quite a bit after. So</p> <p>19 these contracts would have had the</p> <p>20 earlier name, not the Emblem name, but</p> <p>21 representing the same entities.</p> <p>22 Q. Right. And you recall, we can</p> <p>23 pull them up if you like, but the two PBM</p> <p>24 contracts that you looked at earlier and</p> <p>25 that you cite in your report make</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 150</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 reference to the same names referenced</p> <p>3 here in this exhibit, Group Health</p> <p>4 Incorporated and HIP Insurance Company of</p> <p>5 New York, right?</p> <p>6 MS. BRANCATO: Objection to</p> <p>7 form.</p> <p>8 A. That is correct.</p> <p>9 Q. And does this refresh your</p> <p>10 recollection as to whether there was any</p> <p>11 name change involving GHI and HIPIC?</p> <p>12 A. It certainly does and I</p> <p>13 apologize for not having remembered this</p> <p>14 earlier. I knew those contracts applied</p> <p>15 to Emblem and I just didn't recall that</p> <p>16 the name change was what had taken place</p> <p>17 and explains that.</p> <p>18 Q. And with the benefit of now</p> <p>19 having your memory refreshed with this</p> <p>20 exhibit, what, if anything, would you</p> <p>21 change in your report about the</p> <p>22 discussion of those two contracts that</p> <p>23 you testified today as to Emblem?</p> <p>24 A. Sounds as though I should have</p> <p>25 added a parenthetical that says, "Now</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 152</p> <p>1 C E R T I F I C A T E</p> <p>2 I, MAUREEN M. RATTO, a</p> <p>3 Registered Professional Reporter, do</p> <p>4 hereby certify that prior to the</p> <p>5 commencement of the examination, LAURA</p> <p>6 R. CRAFT was sworn by me to testify</p> <p>7 the truth, the whole truth and nothing</p> <p>8 but the truth.</p> <p>9 I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that the</p> <p>10 foregoing is a true and accurate</p> <p>11 transcript of the proceedings as taken</p> <p>12 stenographically by and before me at</p> <p>13 the time, place and on the date</p> <p>14 hereinbefore set forth.</p> <p>15 I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am</p> <p>16 neither a relative nor employee nor</p> <p>17 attorney nor counsel of any of the</p> <p>18 parties to this action, and that I am</p> <p>19 neither a relative nor employee of such</p> <p>20 attorney or counsel, and that I am not</p> <p>21 financially interested in this action.</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24  MAUREEN M. RATTO, RPR</p> <p>25 License No. 817125</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 151</p> <p>1 LAURA CRAFT</p> <p>2 renamed as EmblemHealth plan". That</p> <p>3 would have been helpful.</p> <p>4 Q. But other than that, any other</p> <p>5 changes?</p> <p>6 A. No, nothing of substance.</p> <p>7 MR. STANOCH: That's all I</p> <p>8 have. Thank you, Ms. Craft.</p> <p>9 MS. BRANCATO: I have no</p> <p>10 further questions at this time.</p> <p>11 MR. STANOCH: I think we're</p> <p>12 done. We will read and sign.</p> <p>13 VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is</p> <p>14 11:47. This ends today's</p> <p>15 deposition.</p> <p>16 (The proceedings were</p> <p>17 adjourned at 11:47 p.m.)</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 153</p> <p>1 I N D E X</p> <p>2 WITNESS: LAURA R. CRAFT 7</p> <p>3 EXAMINATION BY MS. BRANCATO 7</p> <p>4 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY 147</p> <p>5 MR. STANOCH</p> <p>6 E X H I B I T S</p> <p>7 Exhibit 1, notice of deposition 32</p> <p>8 Exhibit 2, Expert report of 35</p> <p>9 Laura Craft dated November 10,</p> <p>10 2021</p> <p>11 Exhibit 3, expert report of 35</p> <p>12 Laura Craft dated October 31,</p> <p>13 2022</p> <p>14 Exhibit 4, OnPoint Analytics 40</p> <p>15 invoices dated January 1, 2022</p> <p>16 to October 31st, 2022</p> <p>17 Exhibit 5, Express Scripts PBM 122</p> <p>18 Agreement, Bates</p> <p>19 MSP-EMBLEM-000445</p> <p>20 Exhibit 6, Express Scripts 134</p> <p>21 Senior Care MPS agreement, Bates</p> <p>22 MSP-EMBLEM-0000541</p> <p>23 Exhibit 7, document entitled GHI 147</p> <p>24 and HIPIC Renamed EmblemHealth,</p> <p>25 dated June 15, 2021</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 154</p> <p>1 DAVID J. STANOCH, ESQ. 2 d.stanoch@kanner-law.com 3 January 16, 2023 4 RE: In Re: Valsartan, Losartan, Et Al v. 5 1/12/2023, Laura R. Craft (#5659784) 6 The above-referenced transcript is available for 7 review. 8 Within the applicable timeframe, the witness should 9 read the testimony to verify its accuracy. If there are 10 any changes, the witness should note those with the 11 reason, on the attached Errata Sheet. 12 The witness should sign the Acknowledgment of 13 Deponent and Errata and return to the deposing attorney. 14 Copies should be sent to all counsel, and to Veritext at 15 cs-ny@veritext.com 16 17 Return completed errata within 30 days from 18 receipt of testimony. 19 If the witness fails to do so within the time 20 allotted, the transcript may be used as if signed. 21 22 Yours, 23 Veritext Legal Solutions 24 25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 156</p> <p>1 In Re: Valsartan, Losartan, Et Al v. 2 Laura R. Craft (#5659784) 3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF DEPONENT 4 I, Laura R. Craft, do hereby declare that I 5 have read the foregoing transcript, I have made any 6 corrections, additions, or changes I deemed necessary as 7 noted above to be appended hereto, and that the same is 8 a true, correct and complete transcript of the testimony 9 given by me. 10 11 _____ 12 Laura R. Craft Date 13 *If notary is required 14 SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS 15 _____ DAY OF _____, 20____. 16 17 18 _____ 19 NOTARY PUBLIC 20 21 22 23 24 25</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 155</p> <p>1 In Re: Valsartan, Losartan, Et Al v. 2 Laura R. Craft (#5659784) 3 E R R A T A S H E E T 4 PAGE____ LINE____ CHANGE_____ 5 _____ 6 REASON_____ 7 PAGE____ LINE____ CHANGE_____ 8 _____ 9 REASON_____ 10 PAGE____ LINE____ CHANGE_____ 11 _____ 12 REASON_____ 13 PAGE____ LINE____ CHANGE_____ 14 _____ 15 REASON_____ 16 PAGE____ LINE____ CHANGE_____ 17 _____ 18 REASON_____ 19 PAGE____ LINE____ CHANGE_____ 20 _____ 21 REASON_____ 22 _____ 23 _____ 24 Laura R. Craft Date 25</p>	

[& - 32]

Page 1

&	147 153:4,23	74:2 143:10	23rd 41:13 42:6
& 3:4 4:12,20 5:4,21	15 148:3,16 153:25	148:3,16 149:13 153:10	24 119:21
0	15219 5:8	153:25	24th 42:12
0000541 134:18 134:21 153:22	16 154:3	2022 11:7,11	25 114:3
000445 122:6 122:13 153:19	1601 4:13	19:6,11,12	2525 3:22
02116 5:23	17425 152:24	20:12,17 21:9	26 136:11 138:4 139:25
1	19 24:5 44:8 100:12	21:17 22:19	26th 42:18
	19th 44:12	23:7,12 24:5	27 127:16 140:12 142:6
	1st 140:21	25:9,9,11,12	27th 42:18
	2	28:5,6 30:3,5	28202 4:22
1 7:5 32:12,13 32:14 33:2 40:3,13 60:10 70:23 125:4 127:25 128:18 133:13 153:7 153:15	2 35:2,4,5,9,10 48:4 51:15 61:2 71:3 144:21 153:8	30:23 35:21	2875 1:3
1/12/2023 154:5	2.87 136:24	36:2 38:14,24	28th 42:18
10 10:18 35:6 97:8,12 153:9	20 114:2 156:15	39:6,16 40:3,4	29 127:14,15
100 97:9	2003 90:2	40:13,14,19,22	29th 140:17,17
105 96:23	2006 90:3	41:4,9,13 42:7	2nd 5:15
10th 35:13	2009 140:21	42:12 44:8,13	3
11:25 144:20	2011 140:17	46:15 50:24	3 35:19,19,20 35:24 36:17,24 37:11 60:2,5,11 60:21 61:2 74:8 144:25 153:11
11:40 144:25	2012 137:21	52:6 60:3 65:3	30 154:17
11:47 151:14 151:17	2017 125:4 140:18,22 141:10,14,17 141:21 142:13	73:17,24 79:9	301 5:6
12 1:15	2018 136:16	79:21 100:7	31 35:21 36:20 39:6 125:5 153:12
122 153:17	2019 125:5	110:21,24	31st 36:2 40:4 40:13,18 41:4,9 41:18 48:23 153:16
12th 7:3 140:22	2020 110:13,21 111:12,18 137:22	111:19 113:18	32 153:7
134 153:20	2021 10:18 19:19 35:6,13 37:8 73:18	114:12,22	
13th 40:22		143:3,8 153:13	
14 74:24 79:3		153:15,16	
		2023 1:15 7:4 154:3	
		21 81:17	
		22 49:10 65:12	
		227 4:21	
		23 116:19 136:15,18	
		230 4:6	

[33 - adjourned]

Page 2

33 135:4	65 90:7,25	89:6 133:9	actually 13:9
33131 5:16	7	abuse 11:22	31:10 41:23
33134 3:23	7 122:18 124:21	13:4,13	76:2 86:5 87:9
333 5:15	147:25 153:2,3	accept 71:18	107:21 109:9
35 153:8,11	153:23	accidently	133:11,25
4	701 3:5	136:5	actuarial 95:3
4 39:24,25 40:2	70310 3:6	accommodate	95:14
41:11 42:2	75201 4:14	92:6	actuary 110:7
48:2 53:6	8	account 68:6	add 47:20 78:2
122:20 153:14	817125 2:10	77:21 94:23	79:3 94:15
40 153:14	152:25	104:11,15	108:3
4240 6:6	8:00 1:16	accuracy 138:6	added 150:25
445 123:3	8:02 7:3	138:11 139:6	addition 11:24
5	9	154:9	additional 8:6
5 33:9,10 97:7	9 74:7,10	accurate 81:23	10:21 11:5
102:4,13 103:4	90 44:18 46:25	109:8 152:10	25:24 26:2,16
103:12 122:2,3	47:11	accurately 60:6	31:4 38:23
122:4,12 123:4	900 3:14	86:22 96:18	39:5,12 40:17
123:8 125:7	95 104:5	accused 100:3	41:2 44:5 46:4
126:5 127:15	9:32 70:22	acknowledge...	46:9 81:5
132:17 147:16	9:42 71:3	156:3	93:13 130:22
153:17	a	acknowledg...	140:24 141:4
500 5:22	a.m. 1:16	154:12	142:8
5659784 154:5	ability 29:13	acquired 25:5	additions 156:6
155:2 156:2	81:3,9 90:7	acronym 31:20	address 13:13
6	able 14:19 59:4	act 12:3 93:6	100:15
6 134:15,16,19	59:5 116:11	action 15:7	addresses
135:8 147:16	123:20	62:21 152:18	16:22
153:20	above 108:21	152:21	adequacy 51:2
60 44:18 46:25	108:25 109:15	activity 117:12	52:20
47:11	142:20 154:6	actual 31:15	adequate 71:21
60606 4:7	156:7	41:25 102:13	90:13
63110 6:7	absolutely	107:15,23	adjourned
	56:13 85:4	109:13 127:16	151:17

[adjudicated - answering]

Page 3

adjudicated 44:17	ago 52:10 55:21 119:9 146:7,12	alfano 5:4	87:7 94:9
adjudication 24:19 75:3,19 76:18 82:8	agree 38:4 82:15 87:3,4 94:6 104:22 131:22	allegation 15:22	96:21 99:8 107:2 108:23 129:15,23 133:11 143:24
adjusted 105:3 107:14 129:17	agreed 120:4 121:2 130:20	allegations 60:17	amounts 71:15 80:10 93:14,21 98:23 99:10,14 104:18,25
administrative 11:20 13:2,7,19 14:7,18 97:20	agreement 122:5 124:24 125:15 126:6 127:4 130:25 134:20 153:18 153:21	alleged 60:12 62:4 63:4,15 66:13 70:7	analysis 42:22 70:5 138:10
adopting 92:23		allegedly 98:16	analyst 51:6
adulterated 69:5,7,11		allocate 43:13 109:18	analytic 117:19
advance 36:19 36:21	agreements 122:21 124:16	allocated 45:18 103:21	analytics 40:2 153:14
adverse 91:25	agrees 98:4	allocation 77:20	analyzed 81:14
affect 69:22 71:8	ahead 9:25 18:23 30:11 32:11 34:4 38:3,25 41:20 44:3 46:20 51:19 63:25 88:10 100:9 101:14 104:3 107:8 114:15 128:22	allocations 81:6 81:10	andras 5:17
affiliate 53:23		allotted 154:20	andrast 5:18
affiliated 55:22 123:25		allow 58:25 68:18 73:11 92:16 129:6	announcement 37:12
affiliates 56:2		allowed 14:9 66:17	answer 14:10 17:13,23 21:11 34:5 35:15 52:10 54:18 72:11 85:15 94:13 95:21 96:2 103:10 118:22 121:15 121:19 127:5 127:13 132:25 133:2 146:23
affiliation 54:2 54:4		allows 117:18	answered 39:3
affiliations 64:23		alter 130:12	answering 82:25
afford 90:9		alternative 71:23 72:7,9	
affordable 90:20	al 12:2 14:22 154:4 155:1 156:1	alters 105:8	
afraid 52:9		ambiguity 29:22	
age 91:10	albertson's 4:18	ambiguous 107:8	
agent 97:20		amount 28:17 71:19 72:2 78:10,11 82:11	
aggregate 91:22 108:18	alexia 4:15 7:24 alexia.brancato 4:16		

[answers - awp]

Page 4

answers 8:18 antithetical 59:9 antitrust 11:16 11:19 anybody 132:12 apologize 86:9 150:13 apparent 64:5 appear 19:23 27:13 35:16,25 40:15 42:17 appeared 138:15 appears 19:22 27:14 31:17,21 41:21 42:2 51:14 55:2 65:11 135:12 appended 156:7 applicable 85:7 154:8 applied 109:17 128:9 130:8 150:14 applies 97:4 apply 130:9 appreciate 8:9 62:25 83:4 approach 71:24 appropriate 15:18	approved 77:10 approximately 22:22 36:16 41:16 136:15 136:24 argue 69:10 argument 68:21 93:25 arps 5:21 arrangements 83:13,22,25 84:4,13,19,24 arrive 80:9 arriving 79:15 articles 21:6 asked 30:17 31:6 54:19,20 66:24 99:20 100:24 116:13 asking 72:18 101:19 106:22 107:10 124:22 127:12 132:5 133:21 135:11 asks 115:7 assigned 68:5 140:15,20,23 141:4,20 142:5 assignment 24:13 60:7,21 60:23,25 141:8 141:12,25 assignments 142:8	assignors 37:18 associated 14:20 association 56:23 assume 9:17 10:3 104:13 130:9 assumes 88:19 assumption 86:25 89:18 94:7 99:23 assumptions 142:16 assure 58:19 62:19 66:12 126:9 attached 19:10 19:12 20:15,16 30:2 64:17 65:8 154:11 attaching 65:2 attempt 138:21 attempted 80:23 92:10 105:11 attention 11:2 146:3 attorney 42:25 43:2 116:16,18 152:17,20 154:13 attorneys 5:3 5:12	attractive 93:2 attributable 29:11 audible 47:8 audit 58:17 59:16,19,22,25 138:22 audited 59:12 auditor 59:22 authoritative 139:3 automatic 29:23 122:23 124:15 automatically 29:14 available 29:6 98:5,17 154:6 avenue 5:15 6:6 average 91:9 129:9 aware 38:10 40:25 42:7 44:9 47:10 54:5 55:10,18 55:22 70:7 84:2 85:10 101:4 123:23 126:3,19 135:7 136:9 141:15 141:18 147:20 awp 129:21
---	---	---	--

[b - budget]

Page 5

b	bates 37:15	belong 97:9	boston 5:23
b 12:9 66:6	122:5,13	benchmarks	bottom 41:12
153:6	134:17,20	129:19	98:18 134:5
back 16:5 19:2	153:18,21	beneficial	box 69:21
21:19 22:2,13	becoming	69:12	boylston 5:22
24:18 48:2	90:11	beneficiaries	brackets
55:16 61:15	beginning	63:23	103:18
71:4 73:11	96:21 103:9	beneficiary	brancato 4:15
77:21 83:3	140:16	75:24	7:22,24 9:3
105:23 112:12	begins 144:25	benefit 76:6,13	18:10 40:23
113:8 114:19	behalf 8:4	150:18	70:10,17 82:21
115:6,7 120:18	61:12 145:11	best 8:24	85:23 101:15
123:7 139:2	145:14	beyond 48:15	125:11 131:9
145:2	behavior 69:15	142:13	132:5 134:11
background	69:19,24	bid 145:11,16	144:16 146:24
81:25	behnke 11:25	145:17	147:7,15 150:6
bansantin 12:6	14:22	bidding 107:16	151:9 153:3
base 108:6,7	believe 11:15	big 68:14	brand 129:8
based 51:23	14:8 20:18	bigger 101:17	branded 12:9
74:21 80:7,15	22:18 25:18	bills 51:9	111:23
107:15,17,21	29:24 30:21,24	bily 6:12 7:9	break 70:13,20
117:2,5,13	31:16 34:6,10	bind 125:7,14	75:13,15
129:6 130:15	44:7 53:22	binds 126:5	107:11 144:19
142:11,15	64:17,24 65:24	bipc.com 4:24	brief 21:17
143:11	65:25 67:10,13	bit 54:19 55:13	147:9
basic 45:20	68:7 85:14	149:18	briefly 87:24
73:20 75:3,8	86:24 92:21	black 69:21	brings 115:5
88:25 94:7	106:7,11	blackwell 6:5	broader 28:24
95:22	110:19 122:19	blood 68:24	49:11 64:17
basically 30:25	147:16	blurry 71:13	117:20
65:6	bellwether	borne 102:5	broken 76:16
basis 103:15	26:10 28:22	103:3	143:25
107:14 119:15	29:2,13 30:19	boscik 5:4	buchanan 4:20
bate 135:17	46:22 49:13	bosentan 11:15	budget 103:20
	62:2 74:5	12:8	104:13,19

[budgeted - changes]

Page 6

budgeted 96:21 96:24 97:13 104:5 business 11:21 56:17 89:2,10 102:18,19 117:13,14,15 119:12,13,15 119:17 businesses 89:4 92:22 buy 90:10 buys 114:18	call 21:22 91:6 131:3,15 called 90:8 113:23 calls 100:19 camp 3:5,14 cancelled 114:9 cancer 67:7,12 68:9,16 capabilities 47:11 capacity 91:14 116:15 caps 77:25 capture 75:17 capturing 50:12 car 113:7 card 69:3 113:5 113:12 care 58:12 134:20 153:21 career 115:24 careful 67:25 caremark 12:2 14:22 15:22 16:2 17:5,25 18:15 139:10 caremark's 16:24 carillon 4:21 carolina 4:22 case 8:2 9:23 10:14 11:16,25 12:3,4,12,16,19	12:24 13:2 14:25 15:9,15 15:22 16:5,7 17:4 18:7,15 19:4,13,22,24 20:20 24:4 29:13 32:2 44:21 45:6 46:3,22 47:19 48:14 64:18 69:7 70:3 71:7 71:11 77:8 87:11 89:4 99:3,19 111:24 119:18 121:12 129:7,22 131:8 133:20 137:16 139:9,18 144:7 149:8 cases 11:3,5,11 13:7 19:2 20:11 21:5 119:9 131:18 catastrophic 78:25 79:24 80:20 109:2,18 catch 12:5 51:12 category 74:20 128:24 cause 17:6 68:9 68:15 caused 16:2 108:20	causing 17:25 67:7 139:12 caution 42:24 ccr 1:24 cease 56:15 centers 83:14 centre 5:7 certain 8:5 46:8 48:11 108:18 147:17 certainly 38:11 49:14 67:4 69:20 116:5 121:8 138:13 150:12 certification 12:13,21 15:5 certified 2:7 certify 152:4,9 152:15 challenge 90:19 139:5 chance 9:8 148:23 change 39:21 73:22 87:2 95:19 147:23 150:11,16,21 155:4,7,10,13 155:16,19 changed 80:25 changes 39:17 60:22 151:5 154:10 156:6
c			
c 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:19 12:10 65:12,14,22,24 148:14 152:1,1 c.whitely 3:10 calculate 28:17 72:9 143:17,22 144:4 calculated 87:8 95:14 109:7 calculating 98:25 calculation 46:17 52:21 77:20 79:13 121:11 calculations 72:5 california 11:23 13:16			

[changing - companies]

Page 7

changing 87:12 87:15 characteristic 89:17 characteristics 69:13 93:5 107:18 characterizati... 38:5 charge 91:21 112:16,24 charged 76:25 87:13 charges 99:25 charlotte 4:22 check 36:5 60:15 142:25 checking 9:4 chicago 4:7 child 56:24 choose 47:19 47:25 choosing 92:3 chosen 67:13 138:22 chu 31:13 circumstances 14:16 129:10 cite 149:25 cited 21:20 22:3 124:10 127:8 133:23 cites 122:24 citizens 90:9	claim 24:13 44:16 58:18,21 59:13 71:14 77:21 112:14 137:6 144:9 claims 12:3 22:17 23:6,9,19 23:21,22 24:6 24:19 26:16 39:9 46:21,25 47:4,23 49:13 49:17,18,20 52:17 54:24 56:9 57:15 59:2,11 71:9 73:2 74:5 75:2 75:19 82:17,23 95:9 97:25 108:17 113:23 117:11 119:25 120:3,7,8,22,23 121:4 124:18 138:6,11 139:22,23 140:6,15,21,24 141:4,8,13,16 141:20 142:3 142:13 clarification 63:2 83:5 88:11 clarify 86:3 131:15,20 class 12:13,21 15:5,7	clause 60:11 120:25 clean 42:13 cleaned 29:6 cleaning 48:5 clear 21:3 26:6 60:4 61:24 93:18 116:17 118:24 131:21 clearly 34:2 42:6 56:8 57:16,20,23,25 client 57:22 119:25 131:23 131:25 clients 54:22 113:22 clinics 11:23 13:5,15 cmc 84:4 cms 15:19,24 83:19 84:5,9,11 84:16 86:23 96:18 97:2,15 97:22,23,25 98:13,21,24 100:2 103:16 103:21,24 104:8,11,17 105:16,25 106:13 107:2 108:22 109:6 109:21 139:14 139:17,25 145:11,14,16	code 28:20 43:13 74:12,17 74:20 codes 44:24 61:8 73:15 74:9,11 collected 23:14 collecting 34:18 column 62:14 combination 76:12 combined 91:15 combining 117:17 come 46:17 52:16 58:21 94:2,4 132:9 comes 24:7 100:2 commencem... 152:5 commercial 92:17,19 93:2,5 93:11 94:18 117:15 119:13 commingle 59:10 commissioners 56:23 common 114:2 communicati... 43:3 companies 56:14,20 89:6
---	---	--	---

[companies - contamination]

Page 8

119:4 company 55:11 55:14,19 57:9 118:7 119:2 123:14 125:3 149:4,11 150:4 compare 19:9 compared 22:16 comparing 94:16 comparison 25:8 26:13 28:4 compartment... 95:17 compile 62:22 compiled 65:5 complete 138:15 156:8 completed 154:17 completely 54:25 68:12,25 95:23 components 27:4 76:3 144:2 compound 106:20 comprised 71:19 computed 109:12	computer 10:9 computing 84:15 conceivably 119:10 conceive 118:21 concept 94:14 118:9 conceptually 79:5 concierge 6:12 conclusion 43:21 52:19 138:4 conclusions 50:4 condition 68:9 conducted 70:9 conducting 10:6 confident 20:20 confidential 17:10 132:23 confidentiality 17:20 18:6 confirm 115:15 confirmed 64:24 conformed 28:13 conforms 121:8 conlee 3:9 connect 114:6	connected 86:2 connecticare 26:8 30:8,22 53:10,14,16,20 53:23 54:6,13 54:24 55:11,15 55:19 56:8 57:15 58:13,21 123:13,22,24 124:6 125:2,18 connecticut 53:25 connection 10:16 11:14,18 11:25 39:7,13 98:9 consequences 97:8 consider 46:11 110:6 considerably 117:9 considered 37:22 39:5 132:22 consist 44:18 consistent 43:6 43:17,23 67:14 85:9 116:22 consisting 90:24 constitute 114:2 construct 88:25	constructed 107:16 construction 68:25 113:16 consulting 75:22 76:20 consumer 68:14,16 69:15 69:19,24 75:20 75:24 77:7,14 77:22 78:7 79:17 80:3,12 80:24 89:11 91:10 92:12 93:23 94:3,4 101:9,12,17 110:2 115:5 consumer's 78:9 80:20 101:25 consumers 27:3 70:5 82:2 91:5 91:22 94:10,21 contain 67:8 contained 43:10 containing 61:9 61:25 66:5 contains 68:15 112:14 126:10 contaminated 60:12 62:5 63:5,16 68:8 contamination 60:18 66:8,9,12
---	---	---	--

[contamination - couple]

Page 9

67:7,18 70:8 contemporan... 24:20 content 27:13 34:11 contents 17:11 contest 139:5 contexts 112:9 continue 70:6 92:5 continued 4:1 5:1 6:1 contract 55:7 84:21 116:8,14 119:23 120:18 121:16 122:24 123:8,10,21 124:5 125:7,12 126:4,20,21 129:23 134:2,4 135:12,16 contracting 83:17,21 contracts 37:17 37:18 38:6 55:8 84:11 85:6 115:11,17 115:21 116:21 117:6 121:22 122:15,25 124:9 126:18 127:8,9 129:19 130:3 135:9 136:2 147:17 149:17,19,24	150:14,22 contradicted 96:15 contribute 27:8 contributes 108:23 contributions 78:18 89:12,14 96:6 control 24:17 66:23 93:6 controlled 44:24 controls 45:2 convention 56:25 conversation 21:18 copies 154:14 copy 9:22 19:16 35:12 coral 3:23 corporate 14:4 54:3 55:25 56:3,6 57:7 147:22 corporations 55:23 correct 10:5,19 12:25 16:8 18:17 19:8,21 25:3,14 30:13 37:3,9,16 39:23 60:18,19 63:17 65:23 66:6	69:15 71:11 72:7,16 73:18 74:9,14,18 83:23 85:13,20 86:17 98:19 99:6,16 100:7 101:6,8,12,22 101:23 104:19 110:16 111:3,5 111:15 115:8 115:13,17 121:14,20 123:5,17,18 128:6,7 130:11 130:16 140:7 140:18,22 141:21 143:3 143:13,14 150:8 156:8 corrected 114:8 correction 61:19 110:19 corrections 156:6 correctly 15:12 19:8 50:2 86:22 99:13 114:10 124:4 corridor 97:7 105:3 cost 14:19 27:2 27:3,20 45:17 76:24 77:6,11 79:16 80:2,15 80:17,18,21	81:6,10 87:16 90:5,17 101:16 101:25 102:14 102:22,23 103:5 104:6,7 105:13 106:14 107:4 108:9 129:6 143:17 144:2 costs 81:5 89:3 92:6,11 93:7 94:24,24 95:15 96:20,23,25 97:5,6,13 102:4 102:10,17,19 102:25 103:10 104:4,12 counsel 3:3,12 3:19 4:3,11,18 5:20 6:3 7:13 15:11,12 21:18 24:4 34:16 40:18 41:3,14 41:22 42:4 65:2,5,18,25 124:21 125:8 142:17 147:4 152:17,20 154:14 counterparties 130:24 country 90:4 couple 27:14 76:3 86:6
--	--	---	--

[course - d]

Page 10

course 8:22 44:15 49:11 55:18 77:15 105:6 115:23 146:3 court 1:1 2:7 7:11,15 8:20 9:9 16:14 100:21 cover 77:10 91:19 92:6 95:15 101:11 coverage 49:4 50:18 52:14,20 78:6,8,21,22 79:10 80:11 81:4,10 90:14 90:16,21 94:19 110:3 covered 63:22 75:20 76:9 90:24 93:15 covering 40:13 41:3 141:16 craft 1:13 2:4 7:1,7,23 8:1,13 9:1 10:1,13 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1 16:1 17:1,19 18:1 19:1 20:1 21:1 21:12 22:1 23:1,4 24:1 25:1 26:1 27:1 28:1 29:1 30:1	31:1 32:1,17 33:1,4,6 34:1,5 35:1,6,9,21,24 36:1,15 37:1 38:1,25 39:1 40:1,7,11 41:1 42:1 43:1 44:1 45:1 46:1 47:1 48:1 49:1 50:1 51:1 52:1 53:1 53:8 54:1 55:1 56:1 57:1 58:1 59:1 60:1 61:1 62:1 63:1 64:1 65:1 66:1,3 67:1 68:1 69:1 69:14 70:1,18 71:1,5 72:1,13 73:1,13 74:1,25 75:1 76:1 77:1 78:1 79:1 80:1 81:1 82:1 83:1 83:7 84:1 85:1 86:1,12 87:1 88:1,10,13 89:1 90:1 91:1 92:1 93:1 94:1 95:1 96:1 97:1 98:1 99:1 100:1 101:1 102:1 103:1 104:1 105:1 106:1 107:1 108:1 109:1 110:1,4 111:1,11 112:1	113:1 114:1 115:1,10 116:1 117:1 118:1 119:1 120:1 121:1,21 122:1 122:10,14 123:1 124:1 125:1,6,20,23 126:1 127:1,17 128:1 129:1 130:1 131:1 132:1,7,14,15 133:1,21 134:1 134:24 135:1,7 136:1 137:1 138:1 139:1,8 140:1,11 141:1 142:1 143:1 144:1 145:1,3 146:1,25 147:1 147:11 148:1 148:10 149:1 150:1 151:1,8 152:6 153:2,9 153:12 154:5 155:2,24 156:2 156:4,12 create 42:14 51:9,14 69:3 89:5 created 51:23 52:12 creates 77:11 77:15	creating 48:7 creation 89:25 credit 68:22 113:5 crisis 90:5 cs 154:15 current 20:9 26:9 28:22,25 55:14 currently 24:15 78:7 81:24 139:10 customary 129:12 customer 79:23 cv 19:10,11 20:14 cvs 19:10 d d 4:23 6:8 15:20 30:2 59:5 61:3,6,8 61:14,23 62:14 62:18,24 63:2 64:9,25 72:15 72:21 78:5,13 78:16 83:9,11 83:18,22 84:3,8 84:23 85:12,17 86:14,16 87:11 88:3,22 89:15 89:25 90:24 92:9,23 93:19 94:17 95:2,16 96:8 100:5,16
--	--	--	--

[d - delivered]

Page 11

102:6 103:23 119:11 145:4 145:12,15,20 146:6,8,11,16 146:21 153:1 d.stanoch 3:8 154:2 dallas 4:14 damage 13:17 52:21 144:7,9 damages 46:2,6 46:12,17 71:11 71:14,19 72:7 81:19 82:12 99:2,17,19,21 100:2 121:11 143:18 144:11 dancing 104:24 data 22:14,17 22:21 23:6,10 23:11,12,13,15 23:23 24:6,7,8 24:10,12,15 25:8,10,12 26:9 27:25 28:4,5,9 28:13,15,16,24 29:5,9,16 30:5 30:7,15,17,22 30:23 31:3,7,18 32:10 38:15 39:9 42:13 43:4,7,16,19,22 43:24 44:7,17 45:5,23 46:16 47:2,3,4,5,10	47:15,24 48:6,9 49:5,17,18,20 49:23 50:17 51:2,5,6 52:3 52:13,15,19,20 52:24 54:6,23 56:9 57:11,15 58:3,7,11,14 59:2,6 62:15 64:5 71:9,20 72:2,22,25 73:2 73:3,8,20 76:13 79:8,18,20 80:13,24 81:11 81:21 82:6,18 82:21,23,24 84:10 99:13 110:11,12,20 110:23 111:10 111:11,21,25 112:13 113:17 113:21 114:3 114:11,22 120:8,10,11,22 120:23 121:5 124:17 133:14 137:10,15,18 137:24 138:2,6 138:11,19 139:2,6,13,15 139:22,23 140:2,6 141:15 142:2,4,12,21 142:25 143:2 143:11,16	144:3,13 dataset 139:23 datasets 25:16 28:7 date 11:5,24 18:24 20:7,21 23:10,18 24:2 25:18 32:16 35:8,23 36:20 36:22 39:6 40:5 42:6 48:11 50:22,22 80:7 122:7 134:22 138:2 141:2 148:4 149:16 152:13 155:24 156:12 dated 35:6,21 40:3,21 148:3 148:15 149:13 153:9,12,15,25 dates 20:8 74:22 dave 9:7 85:23 david 3:7 21:19 154:1 day 92:7 156:15 days 154:17 de 3:22 death 91:24 december 22:19 23:7 24:5 25:11,12 28:6 30:5,23	38:14 40:22 44:8,12 46:15 79:9,21 100:12 110:13,21,24 111:12 113:18 114:12,22 125:5 143:2,8 decide 137:20 decided 113:7 declare 156:4 decomposition 27:2 deductible 27:5 77:24 78:20 deductibles 76:8 deemed 156:6 defendant 4:3 4:11,18 5:3,12 5:20 6:3 131:2 131:17,24 132:2 defendant's 61:24 defendants 8:2 8:5 28:21 29:4 29:12 62:2 69:6 71:18 130:21 147:6 defense 147:3 define 118:3 defining 113:14 deliver 119:24 delivered 120:10,13,21
--	--	--	---

[delivered - divide]

Page 12

120:23 demographic 107:18 demographics 91:11 department 113:4 dependent 109:7 depending 113:14 depends 103:17 deponent 154:13 156:3 deposed 8:14 10:13 14:7 18:15,18 20:5 20:17 21:4 deposing 154:13 deposition 1:12 2:3 7:6 8:4 10:10,20 12:16 12:24 18:25 19:4,25 20:4,7 20:18,19,21,24 20:25 21:8,13 26:13 32:15 33:3 38:22 39:8,14 41:7 101:2,6 151:15 153:7 depositions 14:8 20:8,13 22:8,11 32:2	derived 137:15 describe 52:15 59:21 96:19 124:8 128:23 described 31:5 34:9,11 50:13 52:2 66:14 91:24 108:8,14 119:20 126:11 129:20 139:24 design 76:7,13 designated 120:2 designed 69:2 73:10 108:24 113:3 detail 25:21,24 detailed 23:20 details 17:14 79:5 determination 46:5,12 80:5,6 determine 28:13 43:5 64:20 70:5 78:19 80:2 81:19 determined 75:19 76:12 78:9 91:2 129:3 133:9 determining 46:2 76:3 82:10	develop 92:24 difference 80:18 97:7 102:13 103:12 103:17,19 differences 16:21 25:16 103:15 different 16:20 18:7 27:14,17 27:22 31:18 44:19 47:12,13 47:14 57:4 92:13 94:5 112:8,9 127:12 135:17 differentiate 54:6,11,21,21 difficult 90:12 106:20 dir 15:19 direct 10:25 55:23 63:7 107:13 direction 102:16 105:4 directly 24:18 29:11 50:22 100:10 126:20 disability 91:4 disabled 91:2 disagree 67:9 88:24 disclosed 19:19	discount 129:10 discuss 17:11 74:10 107:12 133:7 discussed 23:12 38:2 discussing 74:8 discussion 73:14 78:3 150:22 disorder 11:22 disorders 13:13 dispensed 45:19 68:14 dispensing 26:25 43:9 77:2,17 144:2,8 144:15 dispute 79:7 99:12,13 distinct 54:25 distinction 55:2 118:18 distinctive 57:17 distinguishable 57:20,24 58:2 distinguished 58:7 distribution 45:2 district 1:1,2 divide 117:11
---	---	--	--

[divided - emblem]

Page 13

divided 77:9 divulge 18:5 dmc 19:14 document 33:7 122:11 123:3 127:16 128:12 130:8,12,14,18 133:22 134:25 141:15 147:25 149:12 153:23 documents 9:20 22:5 33:21 34:17,19 37:16 140:25 doing 8:8,16 18:12 28:3 29:22 31:15 51:4 52:13 95:17 dollar 78:10,11 80:10 129:15 129:23 dollars 94:5 double 60:15 downside 93:9 draft 101:5 drafted 116:7 drafting 123:24 dramatically 80:21 drops 80:21 drug 12:5,7,10 15:18,23 17:7 18:2 28:20 44:25 45:12	47:23 67:15 68:13 74:16 76:4,8 79:16 87:14 88:24 90:13,15,21 94:11,19 96:20 96:22 97:5,6 102:10,24 103:10 104:4 108:6 115:5 128:19 drugs 45:3 61:9 61:25 62:18,23 66:5 67:5,11 68:8 69:5,8 71:6 72:15,20 73:22 87:9 91:11,16 94:24 98:16 102:25 105:5,10 108:9 109:14 111:23 111:24,25 129:11,16 due 91:4 duly 7:20 duncan 6:6 duplicate 135:8 duties 98:8	earlier 19:19 23:9,11 26:6 30:4 34:16 39:11 53:8 62:12 66:2 73:14 83:8 86:7 124:2,22 139:9 147:15 149:17,20,24 150:14 earliest 50:21 easier 28:10 economic 13:14 economist 28:8 31:12 52:12 edits 60:22 education 146:4 effective 90:2,3 125:4 effectively 23:19 49:22 69:2 77:12 84:16 88:22 92:14 93:12 96:25 effectuate 147:22 efficiencies 117:16 efficient 51:3 117:8,10 effort 52:23 eight 26:22	either 16:2 31:24 97:7 105:4 121:2 129:20 electronic 36:10 75:22 76:20 77:15 112:23,24 elements 27:6 45:24 138:16 eligibility 75:18 ellis 4:12 elm 4:13 email 41:22 emails 41:13 embark 89:4 embarrassing 75:11 emblem 26:15 30:18 31:7,23 32:2,8 46:6 49:7 53:12 58:12,20 59:20 61:21 62:8 72:3 77:8,13 78:4 82:3,6 84:3 85:18 86:15 87:16 99:2 101:10 102:6 103:23 104:12 105:9 105:13,24 106:13 107:3 110:15 111:2 115:12,22
	e e 3:1,1 4:1,1 5:1 5:1 6:1,1 12:9 12:10,10 36:23 37:11 152:1,1 153:1,6 155:3,3 155:3		

[emblem - exhibit]

Page 14

118:14 121:16 121:18 122:6 122:13 123:3 123:19,22 124:3,7 125:7,9 125:13,15,24 126:5 134:6,18 134:21 138:7 138:12 141:9 141:19 143:18 145:5 149:11 149:20 150:15 150:23 153:19 153:22 emblem's 121:16 emblemcare 58:12 82:11 emblemhealth 22:9 24:11,22 24:23 26:11 28:18 30:6 31:2,19 45:7,22 53:9,17,19,21 53:24 54:7,16 54:25 55:11,15 55:20 56:7 57:16 61:11 62:16 81:19 82:12 83:8,12 85:11 98:24 107:24 119:23 119:25 121:6 122:21 123:16 126:22 140:6	140:15 147:18 148:2,15 149:7 149:9 151:2 153:24 employee 145:7 152:16,19 enables 144:4 144:14 enacted 90:2 ends 70:23 144:21 151:14 enormous 90:19 enroll 92:3 enrolled 59:8 enrollees 92:12 enrollment 75:23 91:3 entered 123:11 124:5 entire 77:10 105:6 139:7 entirely 111:6 entities 14:4 56:16 58:25 64:22,23 125:19 127:3 137:7 147:17 147:22 149:21 entitled 11:25 131:9 147:25 153:23 entity 26:8 53:25 127:3	entries 42:11 42:17 44:22 48:5 51:23 entry 41:12 42:2 51:13 112:21 errata 154:11 154:13,17 erroneous 114:6 error 138:19 errors 138:20 especially 47:7 esq 3:7,9,16,24 3:25 4:8,15,23 5:9,17,24 6:8 154:1 essential 47:20 79:15 essentially 103:22 establish 23:9 estimate 115:20 116:4 estimation 95:11 et 12:2 14:22 154:4 155:1 156:1 event 43:9 everybody 138:25 everyone's 8:17 exact 20:21 56:3	exactly 16:19 17:3 54:3 73:25 112:25 126:11 examination 7:22 147:10 152:5 153:3,4 examined 59:23 121:13 examining 28:12 example 27:18 44:23 58:19 63:7 79:24 101:20 112:10 117:14 119:11 129:5 144:8 exceed 96:20 exceeded 109:3 exceeds 116:5 except 82:17 excessive 50:14 excluded 76:10 exclusively 103:3 execute 83:19 exercise 139:19 140:4 exercises 95:3 exhibit 30:2 32:12,13,14,18 33:2 35:4,5,9 35:10,19,20,24 36:17,23,24 37:11,11 39:25
---	---	--	---

[exhibit - fewer]

Page 15

40:2 41:11 48:2 53:6 60:2 60:11 61:3,6,8 61:14,23 62:14 62:18,24 63:2 64:3,9,25 65:11 65:14,22,24 66:6 72:15,21 74:8 122:3,4,12 123:4,8 126:5 127:15,21,22 127:25 128:18 132:17 133:7 133:13 134:16 134:19 135:8 147:25 148:7 148:24 149:2 150:3,20 153:7 153:8,11,14,17 153:20,23 exhibits 127:22 147:15 exist 56:7 67:18 85:7 existed 66:13 expand 54:18 75:12 expanded 31:3 expansion 27:21 expect 14:6 18:18 45:21 99:20 114:16 129:14 138:18	expected 97:5,6 102:4,11,18,20 103:2,11 108:6 expenditures 108:25 109:19 109:20,24 expenses 108:20 expensive 91:12 experience 46:24 58:11 59:6,7 107:17 108:7,18 117:3 117:6,22,25 118:13 128:17 experienced 141:17 expert 11:4 16:4 35:5,20 48:18,23 69:15 69:24 99:19 110:7 131:10 146:15,20 153:8,11 experts 16:24 explain 26:2 124:11 explained 23:13 31:25 73:5 142:20 explains 150:17 explanation 120:19 139:17	explanations 13:14 explicit 80:4,6 explicitly 108:4 express 6:3 24:23 25:5 81:2 99:20 115:12 119:23 121:5,17 122:4 123:11 124:24 125:14,16,17 126:6,20,22 130:25 131:16 132:11 133:18 134:19 136:14 153:17,20 expressing 66:7 69:5 144:10 extend 142:8 extract 42:14 extracted 48:9 extracting 48:6 extremely 80:2 80:15 90:16 138:20 f f 7:19 152:1 facially 54:24 64:5 facilitator 78:13,16 facilities 13:12 13:22 facing 90:4	fact 17:6 57:5 68:23 71:15 72:3,22 95:15 96:17 98:15 99:22 102:3 135:17 139:5 141:16 142:12 failed 38:13 68:5 fails 154:19 fair 9:18 10:10 falkenberg 4:5 falkenbergiv... 4:9 false 12:2 68:12 familiar 146:2 fault 86:11 fda 37:12 68:18 feature 29:15 february 21:9 federal 67:15 84:17 85:13 88:21 89:14 92:14,24 93:20 93:25 94:8 95:11 96:5 97:20 98:4 103:6 fee 26:25 77:2 77:17 144:2,8 144:15 feel 36:9 fewer 143:12 143:16
---	--	---	--

[fhs - fuller]

Page 16

fhs 5:10 field 31:21 58:2 64:7 69:19,25 80:10 91:6 133:4 fields 23:20,25 25:12 26:17,19 26:24 27:11,13 27:15,19,21,23 31:4,18,20,22 43:10 44:5,10 44:15,16,19 45:3,5,8,9,20 46:5,9,11,16,25 47:6,9,12,14,20 48:12 49:19 50:21 55:3 58:3,9 121:9,13 138:14 143:13 143:16 file 32:23 120:4 filed 11:13,17 11:19,23 17:9 20:11 100:12 filing 16:16,25 36:20 filings 16:14 filled 74:14 76:23 78:8 final 62:13 77:4 113:23 finalized 39:15 finance 89:9 146:5	financial 83:13 83:21,25 84:4 84:12 financially 152:21 find 90:12 138:19 fine 70:16,21 147:13 fire 13:18 firm 3:20 7:12 40:12,16 41:2 64:13 65:19 first 7:20 10:25 12:4 19:10 26:5 40:21 41:11,25 75:5 89:22 96:3 97:3 123:9 137:5,10,13 five 70:13,15 70:20 fix 129:22 fixed 101:16 flatly 96:14 flip 103:8 127:24 flom 5:21 florida 3:23 5:16 focused 15:4 134:7 followed 16:15 112:24	following 13:17 33:11 follows 7:21 followup 95:25 footnote 122:18 122:20 124:21 foregoing 152:10 156:5 form 33:17,25 34:21 37:25 38:21 40:21 41:20 42:24 44:3 47:17 48:25 49:6 50:8 52:8 53:4 54:9 56:12 57:19 58:5,16 59:15 63:25 66:22 67:22 69:17 86:5,6,19 87:18 88:10,18 99:5 100:19 101:14 104:3 104:21 105:18 106:6,17 107:7 110:9,18 111:17 114:15 115:3 116:2 118:17 119:7 126:8 128:22 130:18 131:12 135:21 140:9 141:23 143:5 143:21 150:7	formally 141:20 format 28:9 30:25 120:4,5 121:3,6,7 formatted 30:16 119:24 120:3 former 149:8 forming 37:23 50:4 forms 15:19,24 formula 97:14 formulary 76:6 76:10,13 formulas 109:17 forth 75:7 152:14 foundation 107:7 four 75:3 87:24 fourth 75:6 76:17 framed 106:21 frank 5:9 free 36:9 47:24 69:3 frequently 49:20 front 9:24 19:15 36:11 full 8:11 fuller 23:21
---	---	--	---

[function - helped]

Page 17

function 87:22 88:2,7,15 functionally 112:10 functions 24:20 75:4,9,15 fund 89:2 fundamental 102:23 fundamentally 72:8 89:21,23 96:6 100:3 funding 88:20 89:7 94:6 98:5 98:11 99:24 111:7 funds 89:10,15 93:13,25 further 17:14 120:19 146:25 151:10 152:9 152:15	generated 43:7 43:20,25 65:19 112:13 generic 12:7 111:23,24 germane 121:11 getting 93:13 ghi 148:2,14 149:8 150:11 153:23 gilead 19:18 20:23 21:5 give 9:7 36:4 52:9 81:15 given 74:13 86:17 91:13 101:16 117:10 117:17 119:5 139:16 156:9 go 9:25 14:13 18:23 30:10 32:11,22 33:9 34:4,13 36:12 38:3,25 41:20 44:3 46:19 48:2 51:18 63:25 64:2 68:19 75:4 82:8 83:3 88:10 91:23 100:8 101:14 104:3 107:8 114:15 118:11 120:17 127:14	128:22 goes 77:20 137:10 138:25 going 7:2 8:3 8:23 9:5,17 17:8,14 19:2 35:3 51:20 61:17 65:13 68:16 70:11,23 76:4 91:8 95:4 95:7,8,20 104:13 108:9 111:19 112:17 122:3 126:15 132:9 134:16 144:17,21 147:7 good 7:23 9:3 49:23 116:4 gordon 5:4 government 84:17 85:13,16 86:13 88:21 92:24 94:8 95:12 97:21 103:7 governs 141:12 graduate 146:4 grant 5:6 great 10:12 33:2 36:9 greater 102:25 103:19,20 123:13 124:25	greenberg 5:14 group 90:23 91:18 149:3 150:3 growing 90:5 gtlaw.com 5:18 guys 70:14
h			
h 5:9 148:14 153:6 155:3 half 70:11 96:16 144:18 happen 100:22 147:24 happened 19:6 happens 96:19 103:13 104:17 107:21 108:22 head 26:19 104:25 health 28:8 78:15 90:19 118:11,19 123:12 124:25 149:3,11 150:3 healthcare 31:12 89:8 91:6 110:7 123:19 146:4 hearing 14:14 55:13 147:8 held 2:4 hello 147:11 helped 145:10 145:13			

[helpful - individualized]

Page 18

<p>helpful 151:3</p> <p>hereinbefore 152:14</p> <p>hereto 156:7</p> <p>hesitant 84:25</p> <p>hey 85:23</p> <p>high 68:24 90:16 91:5,7,8 91:15 95:9 108:19</p> <p>higher 74:20 92:4,4 97:6 99:25 102:9,17 102:20</p> <p>highlight 64:3 138:23</p> <p>highlighted 51:17</p> <p>highly 56:17</p> <p>hilton 3:16</p> <p>hip 123:13 124:6 125:2,10 125:18,25 149:4,10 150:4</p> <p>hipic 123:21 125:18 148:2 148:14 149:10 150:11 153:24</p> <p>historical 107:17</p> <p>history 77:22 100:5 145:19 146:7,10,15,18</p> <p>honestly 20:6 137:23</p>	<p>hope 38:12</p> <p>hosted 2:5</p> <p>hour 70:11 144:17</p> <p>humana 4:3</p> <p>hundred 116:5</p> <p>hundreds 59:23,23</p> <p>husch 6:5</p> <p>huschblackw... 6:9</p> <p>hypothetical 107:9</p> <tr> <td>i</td><td rowspan="2"> <p>i.e. 49:5 94:24 109:2</p> <p>idea 34:24 83:24 100:20</p> <p>identifiable 27:15</p> <p>identification 32:16 35:8,23 40:6 48:12 73:9 122:8 134:23 148:5</p> <p>identified 38:23 55:9 140:25</p> <p>identifies 62:17 80:11 137:13</p> <p>identify 31:23 45:10 65:9 71:10 72:23 73:4 81:3,9 109:19 124:23</p> </td></tr> <tr> <td></td></tr>	i	<p>i.e. 49:5 94:24 109:2</p> <p>idea 34:24 83:24 100:20</p> <p>identifiable 27:15</p> <p>identification 32:16 35:8,23 40:6 48:12 73:9 122:8 134:23 148:5</p> <p>identified 38:23 55:9 140:25</p> <p>identifies 62:17 80:11 137:13</p> <p>identify 31:23 45:10 65:9 71:10 72:23 73:4 81:3,9 109:19 124:23</p>	
i	<p>i.e. 49:5 94:24 109:2</p> <p>idea 34:24 83:24 100:20</p> <p>identifiable 27:15</p> <p>identification 32:16 35:8,23 40:6 48:12 73:9 122:8 134:23 148:5</p> <p>identified 38:23 55:9 140:25</p> <p>identifies 62:17 80:11 137:13</p> <p>identify 31:23 45:10 65:9 71:10 72:23 73:4 81:3,9 109:19 124:23</p>			

<p>identifying 124:7</p> <p>identities 56:19</p> <p>ids 58:18</p> <p>ignores 87:21</p> <p>ignoring 88:6 88:14</p> <p>illinois 4:7</p> <p>imagine 18:20 32:6</p> <p>impact 85:18 86:15 106:12</p> <p>implicitly 79:12</p> <p>imply 83:2</p> <p>important 94:14,20 108:16</p> <p>impossible 91:21</p> <p>improbable 138:21</p> <p>inaccuracies 140:5</p> <p>inaccurate 139:12</p> <p>inaccurately 17:7 18:2 139:13</p> <p>inappropriate 71:24</p> <p>incent 93:3</p> <p>include 26:24 31:4 47:6,9 58:13 79:9 89:11,12</p>	<p>111:13,20 122:23 136:3</p> <p>included 26:17 27:25 29:10 30:23 32:9 39:8 48:11 49:24 80:12 136:5</p> <p>includes 142:21</p> <p>including 29:7 58:18</p> <p>incomplete 107:8</p> <p>incorporated 149:4 150:4</p> <p>incorporating 37:6</p> <p>incorrect 100:3</p> <p>increase 103:5</p> <p>increasingly 90:12</p> <p>incurred 41:8 99:3 141:13</p> <p>independently 107:12</p> <p>individual 16:11 57:2,7 59:7 77:22 88:24 105:22 106:8 124:18 128:25 129:16</p> <p>individual's 78:17</p> <p>individualized 120:22</p>
--	---

[individually - key]

Page 19

individually 84:20 85:3 individuals 90:14,23 108:19 induce 67:12 industry 28:14 29:18 43:10,18 43:23 56:18 58:24 73:10,21 117:3,5 124:14 138:17,25 139:7 infer 80:15 inference 80:4 inferentially 79:25 inform 50:24 information 18:5 26:3,16 27:11 49:15 50:12 79:10 81:25 100:4 110:14,25 111:14 130:5 130:16 132:6 132:17,23 142:21 ingersoll 4:20 ingredient 26:25 27:20 76:24 77:5,11 80:21 101:16 143:25	initial 16:23 19:23 38:10 65:4,6 73:6 78:21,22 injectable 45:3 insinuations 131:6 insistence 130:22 insofar 17:12 instruct 17:17 18:4 instructed 32:7 insurance 27:5 56:13,20,23 57:9 89:6 90:11 91:7 92:8,20 93:11 93:22 94:18 118:7 119:2,4 123:12,14 124:25 125:3 149:4,11 150:4 insured 82:2 107:19 insurer 83:17 91:20 92:17 93:10 119:10 insurers 57:2 92:19 93:2,6 94:21 119:16 intending 89:5 intent 89:24 93:18 96:8	intention 38:11 92:23 interest 93:7 interested 43:15 45:9 152:21 intermediate 52:18 invariably 43:20,24 119:18 inventory 49:23 invoices 40:3 40:12,17 41:2 48:3 153:15 involve 47:11 involved 20:13 26:7 33:21 34:18,24 46:22 involves 14:25 111:24 involving 11:21 49:13 150:11 iqvia 137:12,25 irbesartan 1:8 irrelevant 44:20 98:25 134:5 ish 26:21 issue 71:5,6 100:24 131:6 133:10 issued 10:17 35:13,25 40:12	41:2 issues 100:16 issuing 100:14 items 34:9,13 ives 4:5 j j 3:7 154:1 jail 69:3 janow 4:23 january 1:15 7:3 40:3,13 125:4 137:21 140:21 153:15 154:3 jersey 1:2 jigger 107:21 joint 14:2,4 jonathan 4:23 jonathan.janow 4:24 jorge 3:25 june 148:3,15 149:13 153:25 justin 6:12 7:9 127:16 k kanner 3:4,8 3:10 154:2 kass 3:24 kc 42:12 keep 78:17 kevin 31:13 key 138:24
--	---	--	--

[kind - legal]

Page 20

kind 14:13 49:15 70:4,7 82:6 83:16 94:13,17 95:10 105:12 111:13 kinds 14:12 44:22 92:13 114:21,25 115:4 kirkland 4:12 7:25 kirkland.com 4:16 knepper 6:8 131:4,13,14,23 knew 44:4 55:25 150:14 know 8:14,15 9:14 14:12,15 18:21 20:24 22:22 24:2,4,7 29:19,21 30:22 31:14,22 34:23 36:15 40:7,16 41:23 42:5 45:12,14,15,16 45:17,18 49:16 51:18,22 54:3 54:12,15 55:6 55:25 56:2 63:19,21 68:2 69:18,20 79:21 85:21 88:8 94:12 100:21 108:3 112:5	114:2,24 116:6 120:17 121:4 122:9 127:17 128:15 131:19 135:14 138:17 144:6 knowingly 69:4 69:7 knowledge 43:18 known 68:15 125:25 kosty 21:15 38:15 66:25 68:3 71:25 88:5,14,19 89:13 96:5 99:11 108:13 139:4 kosty's 39:10 39:20 66:10 67:17 68:21 87:20 95:24 99:23 100:11	9:1 10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1 16:1 17:1 18:1 19:1 20:1 21:1 22:1 23:1 24:1 25:1 26:1 27:1 28:1 29:1 30:1 31:1 32:1 33:1,4 34:1 35:1,6,21 36:1 37:1 38:1 39:1 40:1 41:1 42:1 43:1 44:1 45:1 46:1 47:1 48:1 49:1 50:1 51:1 52:1 53:1 54:1 55:1 56:1 57:1 58:1 59:1 60:1 61:1 62:1 63:1 64:1 65:1 66:1 67:1 68:1 69:1 70:1 71:1 72:1 73:1 74:1 75:1 76:1 77:1 78:1 79:1 80:1 81:1 82:1 83:1 84:1 85:1 86:1 87:1 88:1 89:1 90:1 91:1 92:1 93:1 94:1 95:1 96:1 97:1 98:1 99:1 100:1 101:1 102:1 103:1 104:1 105:1 106:1 107:1	108:1 109:1 110:1 111:1 112:1 113:1 114:1 115:1 116:1 117:1 118:1 119:1 120:1 121:1 122:1 123:1 124:1 125:1 126:1 127:1 128:1 129:1 130:1 131:1 132:1 133:1 134:1 135:1 136:1 137:1 138:1 139:1 140:1 141:1 142:1 143:1 144:1 145:1 146:1 147:1 148:1 149:1 150:1 151:1 152:5 153:2,9 153:12 154:5 155:2,24 156:2 156:4,12 law 3:20 7:20 law.com 3:8,10 154:2 layne 3:16 left 109:24 legal 2:6 6:12 115:16,19 154:23
--	--	--	--

legally 58:23 legislative 145:19 146:7 146:10,15,18 lengthy 139:17 leon 3:22 level 57:3 66:9 levels 95:9 lhilton 3:17 liability 1:8 89:18 liberty 17:11 license 2:8,10 152:25 lieu 99:25 likely 45:22 91:11 limited 23:24 29:2 73:7 91:14 line 98:18 117:13 119:15 119:17 134:5 155:4,7,10,13 155:16,19 link 32:19,24 linked 57:22 73:11 137:18 lipitor 11:18 12:19 list 11:3,8 20:9 20:16,22 21:4 29:24 30:2 37:3,11 38:12 38:18 61:8	62:14,22 64:16 64:20,25 65:4,6 65:7,11,15,18 75:2,4 123:16 128:18 129:15 135:18 listed 20:9,22 21:2 22:12 37:22 38:7,8,8 38:18 62:18 64:21 66:5 135:9,12 lists 127:21 133:2 137:11 137:12 literally 104:24 105:4 120:15 litigation 1:9 7:8 10:22 11:17,19 23:2 49:9 130:19 132:4 133:5 142:2 little 55:13 84:6 135:23 llc 3:4 4:19 llp 3:21 4:5,12 5:5,14,21 6:5 locations 74:22 logic 93:24 105:8 long 94:13 95:21 124:16 148:19	longer 70:18,20 look 32:11 35:2 35:18 36:23 39:24 42:9 50:20 51:6 60:2,5,10 61:14 74:7,24 80:25 81:17,20 82:13 82:17 93:17 99:16 120:18 121:21 122:18 124:12 134:15 135:4 136:11 140:11 looked 21:19 22:2,7,13,14,20 23:6 25:11 26:12 71:9 110:12,23 146:5,9 149:17 149:24 looking 48:4 51:13 52:3,18 77:23 78:14 79:18,20 116:19 119:21 123:4,7 looks 19:13 loosely 47:5 losartan 1:7 154:4 155:1 156:1 lose 103:2 loss 97:10 102:21	losses 89:5 96:17,25 lost 8:25 lot 74:13,21 lots 74:16 75:14 louis 6:7 louisiana 3:6 3:15 low 80:2,15 lower 68:23 97:5 102:3,8,10 103:10 104:18 lpa 3:13 lrc 41:13
m			
m 5:17 152:2 152:24 mac 129:6,21 made 22:18 24:21 29:6,21 61:11,21 80:9 98:17 105:5 109:5 156:5 magic 52:22 magnitude 103:17 maintain 56:18 maintained 24:8 make 26:6 39:17 46:13 49:25 57:10 75:9,23 92:21 98:4,20 113:5 116:17 118:19			

[make - mentioned]

Page 22

126:10,16 132:8 133:24 149:25 makes 72:23 73:4 97:18 making 33:21 134:13 manufactured 28:21 29:3 61:9 63:14 manufacturer 63:8 69:4 73:5 73:12 manufacturers 72:24 manufacturing 72:14,17,20 mark 32:13 35:19 39:25 134:16 148:7 marked 10:2 32:15 35:3,7,22 40:5 122:7 127:20 134:22 148:4 market 13:11 93:22 98:3 marketed 62:3 63:3 66:18 marketer 63:7 63:11 martin 5:24 massachusetts 5:23	matching 48:13 62:13 materials 21:20 22:3,6,12 37:2 37:7,10,21 38:7 38:9,24 39:5,13 135:10,13,18 136:4 matt 131:14 matt.knepper 6:9 matter 13:6,20 14:7,23 15:6 16:10,12 17:3 21:2,17 41:9 67:6 127:10 matters 10:22 13:3,8 matthew 6:8 maureen 1:24 2:7 7:12 8:25 152:2,24 maximum 129:6 maz 4:9 mdl 1:3 mdma 68:15 meagher 5:21 mean 18:11 19:20 22:25 47:5 67:20 82:25 83:24 85:21 108:7 112:5,6 118:6,7 119:2 120:15	137:4,5 141:11 142:25 145:6 145:24 meaning 75:20 115:5 means 68:2 69:19 75:22 76:5 112:8 120:20 meant 93:8 110:21 131:19 132:2,21 136:3 143:6 mechanical 52:23 med 78:16 media 7:5 70:23 144:21 144:25 medicaid 83:14 medical 108:20 medicare 15:20 53:18 55:7 59:5 78:5,12 83:9,11,14,18 83:22 84:2,8,23 85:11,17 86:14 86:16 87:10 88:3 89:25 92:9,23 93:19 94:17 95:2,16 96:8 100:5,16 102:6 103:22 117:14 119:11 145:4,11,14,19	146:6,8,11,16 146:20 medication 63:9 medications 90:6,10 91:9 medimpact 25:2,5 115:13 120:24 136:22 137:19 medium 120:9 megan 4:8 member 58:18 58:19,20 62:9,9 108:5 members 45:11 59:3,8 61:12,21 91:18 93:15 94:25 97:24 98:17 99:25 108:25 memory 150:19 mention 25:7 37:5 102:2 113:25 136:13 136:22 mentioned 11:6 12:4,20 13:3 14:21 16:6 23:5 30:4 31:6 46:23 50:16 53:12 62:12 73:13 83:7 119:9 132:7
--	--	--	--

[mentioning - national]

Page 23

mentioning 53:13 mentions 87:25 merchandise 113:8 merely 27:21 62:20 66:24 124:10 mestre 3:21,25 met 78:23 methodology 133:17 144:7 methods 133:7 meyer 3:13 meyershilton.... 3:17 miami 5:16 microphone 51:11 mid 22:18 mind 61:17 mine 8:7 minimal 95:5 minute 10:2 70:13 126:16 minutes 70:15 70:20 mischaracteri... 88:2 126:24 misleading 97:17 misreport 16:3 misreported 16:2	misrepresent 139:12 misrepresent... 139:11 misrepresenti... 127:2 missing 75:10 95:23 136:3 missouri 6:7 misstatements 140:5 misstates 33:25 50:8 misstating 126:25 mistake 135:19 135:25 misunderstan... 39:4 moderate 95:7 modify 61:18 moment 36:4 52:10 55:21 80:8 119:9 148:17 moments 124:22 money 103:2 112:12,18 115:7 monroe 4:6 month 107:13 morning 7:23 39:12 62:13 124:2	motivation 18:12 motivations 18:13 mouth 85:24 move 85:24 moving 79:6 108:10 mps 134:20 153:21 msp 3:19 22:16 22:18,21 23:6,9 23:11,15,18 24:7,9,14,17,17 32:3 37:17 38:6,15 39:9 42:13 43:4,22 44:6,11 45:25 46:16 48:5,9 49:5 54:24 58:8 62:15,23 63:19,22 64:6 71:15 79:8,20 81:11 82:23 110:13,24 111:12 113:17 114:11,21 121:10,23 122:6,13 134:18,21 141:16,21,25 142:12 143:2 143:11,16 153:19,22	msp's 37:18 71:10 multidistrict 132:3 multiple 13:10 13:24 27:19 74:16 137:7,8 multiples 136:5 mutually 120:4 121:2 mylan 5:3
			n
			n 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 12:9,9 153:1 n.v. 5:3 naic 56:25 name 7:9,24 8:11,13 12:5,7 29:4 31:17 63:8 108:15 123:19 137:18 147:22 149:20 149:20 150:11 150:16 named 29:12 31:13 names 27:15,17 32:8 127:3 150:2 narrower 49:12 national 28:20 56:22

[nature - october]

Page 24

nature 58:23 120:11 nepdp 120:3 121:2,6,9 ndc 43:13 61:8 62:14 64:7,16 65:7 73:3,15 74:9,11,12,17 74:20,23 ndcs 28:19 29:8 29:24 48:13 61:20 62:2,7,10 62:20 63:2,13 63:19,22 65:15 necessary 83:2 148:19 156:6 need 42:5 45:8 46:16 70:20 82:5,13,16 91:15 99:22 106:18 133:13 needs 108:20 negative 112:20 113:2,9 negotiated 76:21 84:20 85:3 86:21 130:21 133:18 neither 152:16 152:19 net 85:19,22 never 59:12,16 104:7 107:14 118:20,23	new 1:2 3:6,15 11:11 19:13 20:10 27:24 39:9 41:13,14 42:7 123:13,14 125:2,3 149:5 150:5 newer 28:5 nine 75:15 nodding 8:19 non 82:2 93:22 normal 16:16 normally 129:22 north 4:22 notary 2:10 156:13,19 notation 51:8 note 58:6 139:4 140:14 154:10 noted 7:13 85:25 149:12 156:7 notice 2:6 32:14 33:3 38:22 153:7 noting 86:8 november 10:18 35:6,13 37:8 39:16 73:18 74:2 153:9 number 11:22 22:8 26:21 42:10 47:14	50:20,21 57:22 74:13 92:13 95:5,6,8 96:7,9 96:10,11 107:15 122:24 numbered 37:15 numbering 56:24 57:4 numbers 50:23 112:14 numerous 26:17 ny 154:15	100:8,18 101:7 101:13 104:2 104:20 105:17 106:3,5,16 107:6 110:8,17 111:4,16 114:14 115:2 115:25 118:16 119:6 126:7,23 128:21 130:17 131:5 134:13 135:20 136:7,8 140:8 141:22 143:4,20 150:6
		o	objections 34:2 38:21 132:19 obligation 77:12,16 98:7 obligations 79:14 84:9,10 98:9 obliterate 57:6 observed 25:17 observing 73:7 obviously 36:19 132:2 occurred 20:24 45:13,14 80:9 occurring 141:20 october 11:7,11 19:6,11,12,22 20:12,16 21:17 23:12 25:9 28:5 30:3
		o 12:9 oath 101:2 object 9:8 86:6 objecting 86:5 objection 18:3 22:24 23:3 30:10 33:16,24 34:20 37:24 38:20 40:20 41:19 42:23 44:2 46:19 47:16 48:24 50:7 52:7 53:3 54:8 56:11 57:18 58:4,15 59:14 63:24 66:21 67:21 69:16 85:25 86:18 87:17 88:9,17 99:4	

[october - page]

Page 25

35:21,25 36:20 38:24 39:6 40:4,13,18 41:4 41:9,17 42:2,12 42:18,18 48:23 49:10 50:24 52:6 60:3,25 65:3,12 73:17 73:24 100:7 137:21 143:10 153:12,16 offer 92:20 93:3 offered 98:2 offering 15:14 60:16 66:4,19 72:13 83:17 94:18 115:16 115:18 130:13 132:16 officer 7:21 offset 88:23 105:3 offsetting 112:20,25 113:10 oh 8:24 53:22 65:9 145:17 149:18 okay 8:20 9:3 9:10,15 10:12 11:13 12:11 19:2 21:10 26:5 32:22 33:2 40:9 53:6	53:22 69:11 70:10,13 81:7 82:10 88:19 95:21,25 107:10 121:25 122:11 133:11 134:12 140:13 141:6 144:16 146:24 147:20 148:6,12,21 old 120:15 older 28:4 90:8 90:25 once 16:25 36:3 46:10 62:8,18 85:6 108:3 135:12 147:7 ones 86:7 113:24 127:10 127:13 onpoint 40:2 153:14 open 40:8,10 operate 56:22 84:23 92:17 97:16 operated 78:15 operates 43:19 43:23 53:24 73:20 139:7 operating 102:23 operation 88:3 operations 13:17 47:21	89:11 operator 13:23 operators 13:15,21,25 opine 18:13 opinion 17:5,24 46:14 56:5 57:14 66:4,8,20 67:10,17 69:6 73:6 81:2,8,15 81:18 82:19 98:21 99:7 104:10,14 106:24 117:2 130:14 132:16 143:11,15 opinions 15:14 15:17 17:20,21 37:23 39:21 50:5 52:5 60:16 72:14 99:21 115:16 115:19 144:11 opposed 80:4 94:2 128:25 order 18:6 26:22 81:18 130:20,23 ordered 16:14 100:21 ordinarily 14:9 92:11 124:13 133:6 organizations 13:10	original 20:19 26:20 64:16,18 64:19 65:7,8,10 65:15 103:19 104:13 130:23 originally 28:24 97:13 104:5 143:10 orleans 3:6,15 outside 97:11 overall 27:9 88:3 93:18 101:11 132:3 overinclusive 135:23 overlooks 89:24 oversight 75:12 own 22:4 59:2 65:5 93:8 96:15 129:12 ownership 14:2 14:5 oxford 5:7
p			
p 3:1,1 4:1,1 5:1,1 6:1,1 148:14 p.m. 151:17 page 33:9,10 40:21 41:11 42:10,11 48:4 51:15 122:19 126:17 127:14 127:25 128:5			

[page - pbm]

Page 26

133:25 135:4 155:4,7,10,13 155:16,19 pages 33:11,12 135:5 paid 28:18 43:12 45:16 49:8 63:20 71:15 72:3 76:19 77:2,23 84:15 85:17,19 86:14 87:9,10 87:13 88:23 92:11 93:22 94:10 99:8,14 105:2,9,13 106:12,14 107:4,13 109:9 113:23 119:24 133:15 134:6 143:25 146:2 paper 36:11 paradigm 95:22 paragraph 60:5,6,10,21,23 74:7,10,24 75:2 79:3 81:17,23 116:19 119:21 123:10 136:11 136:22 138:4 139:22,25 140:12 142:6 142:20	paragraphs 61:2 73:23 parameters 84:22 parent 55:10 55:19,24 56:24 57:3 parenthetical 150:25 parents 56:15 part 15:20 16:4 48:14 59:5 78:5,12 83:9,11 83:18,20,22 84:3,8,23 85:12 85:17 86:14,16 87:11 88:3,22 89:15,25 90:24 92:9,23 93:19 94:17 95:2,16 96:8 100:5,16 102:6 103:22 111:8 119:11 138:23 144:9 145:4,12,15,20 146:6,8,11,16 146:21 particular 13:24 14:9 29:8 44:20 47:23 60:7 76:22 79:7,22 79:23 85:19 89:19 101:12 105:14 106:14	107:2,4,20,24 114:7 123:21 126:4 146:10 parties 74:6 152:18 parts 76:16 77:9 79:6 108:10 party 43:14 77:7 98:2,6 102:5 115:22 116:8,15 131:2 131:17,25 patient 13:12 pay 27:5 77:14 77:16 86:16 89:18 91:22 93:16 97:23,25 98:15 99:9 109:21 110:3 payable 112:17 paying 90:16 102:24 133:12 payment 77:12 79:13 payments 61:11 63:22 71:20 104:11 105:4 109:5 111:8 payor 31:17 43:14 54:22 77:7 116:9,15 118:3,25 131:17	payors 45:7 102:5 115:22 117:23 118:2 131:25 137:8 pays 76:7 94:3 94:8 101:9,10 101:11,17,18 101:24 pbm 14:25 15:15,23 24:8 24:11,24 25:3 44:17,17 45:5 54:12,16 57:11 57:14 58:3 59:6,13,17 71:9 72:2 73:2 79:18 81:11,20 82:8,17,21,24 83:3 99:13 110:11 111:9 113:21 114:4 114:25 116:8 116:14,23 117:8,15,18,23 118:2,15,22 119:5,11,17 120:23,24 122:5 124:12 125:15 126:5 126:13 127:9 129:7 137:14 137:19 138:19 139:2,6,13,22 139:23 140:6 147:16 149:17
---	--	--	---

[pbm - plans]

Page 27

<p>149:23 153:17 pbm's 76:20 pbms 24:19 28:15 29:17 46:9,23 47:13 47:23 52:16 54:5,21 57:12 112:13 115:21 117:12,18 121:23 122:22 130:2 132:23 138:7,12 pc 4:20 pde 15:19 pdf 33:9 127:15 135:5 pennsylvania 5:8 people 95:5,6,8 percentage 97:14 103:15 118:2 perfect 9:25 perform 79:12 performed 24:19 59:16,18 70:4 75:16 performing 59:25 performs 75:3 period 49:16 62:4 63:4,15 78:14 137:21 140:16 142:9</p>	<p>permanently 91:2 permit 58:25 personally 33:14,19,20 34:8 64:11 110:4 perspective 73:20 pertained 26:9 pertaining 142:3 pertains 65:21 74:20 82:2 peter 19:18 pharma 4:11 pharmaceutical 69:25 73:9,21 112:13 pharmaceutic... 5:13 pharmacies 99:9,10,15 109:9 pharmacy 4:4 45:15 76:19,22 77:3,14,17 82:6 82:13 86:21 97:23 111:9 112:19 114:20 115:7 128:2,18 128:24 129:11 129:18 130:6 133:8</p>	<p>pharmacy's 129:12 phase 78:6,9,20 78:21,22,22,23 78:25 79:10,24 80:11,20 81:4,9 109:2,6,19 110:3 phone 10:8 phrase 61:19 82:21 98:22 piece 81:25 101:17,18 146:11 pieces 27:8 pietrogallo 5:4 pietrogallo.c... 5:10 pin 104:25 pittsburgh 5:8 place 20:18 124:14 129:4 137:9 150:16 152:13 placed 108:13 places 108:13 plainly 32:5 plaintiff 3:3,12 3:19 15:11,13 22:15 plaintiff's 40:18 41:3 plaintiffs 26:9 30:19 31:8 34:4</p>	<p>plan 55:4,6 59:8 66:19 75:21,25 76:7 76:14 77:13,16 79:17 83:18 84:8,16 86:23 91:17,23 94:11 94:17 95:6 96:13 97:2,9,15 97:19 98:5,11 99:15 100:14 101:10,18,24 102:14,24 103:4,12,16 105:6 107:20 107:24 108:6 108:24 109:16 109:22,24 114:7 117:10 118:6,11,20 123:12 124:17 124:25 126:13 143:24 149:9 151:2 plan's 76:10 plans 15:20 78:5,13,16 80:24 83:23 84:23 85:9 92:20 93:3 94:21 97:25 98:2,15 99:8,24 101:4 117:19 118:8 119:3,4</p>
---	---	---	---

[play - problem]

Page 28

<p>play 111:8 plays 91:25 please 7:15 8:12,19 9:13 11:12 26:4 32:12 35:2,18 39:24 42:10 48:3 55:17 74:8,25 122:2 134:15 140:12 pocket 77:24 78:11,18,24 90:17 108:8,21 109:3,16 point 17:8 18:8 39:18 48:14 69:13 77:19 80:19 102:12 103:4,13 104:23 118:23 118:23 141:3 points 126:11 ponce 3:22 pool 91:7 populated 49:21 64:7 population 90:22 91:14 92:8 107:19 portion 80:20 104:6,6,7,15,16 109:18,20,23 109:25 110:2 position 67:5 87:3 102:21</p>	<p>134:3 positive 113:9 possession 24:16 possible 28:16 71:23 72:23 73:4 78:19 105:22 106:7 106:11 possibly 129:8 potential 27:4 67:12 68:8 71:10 72:6 91:18 143:18 practice 116:18 practices 28:14 72:17 116:22 preamble 123:9 precise 15:25 37:20 42:5 59:7 83:6 84:7 precisely 26:18 28:17 29:19 82:7 143:23 144:5 precursor 79:15 prefer 36:12 50:19 premise 68:12 premium 89:12 92:5 94:2 108:5 premiums 91:21 95:13</p>	<p>prepare 21:13 145:11,14 preparing 39:7 39:14 41:7 preposterous 69:10 prescribe 68:18 129:2 prescribers 68:17 prescription 43:8,12 45:12 74:13 76:23 78:8 85:20 86:17 90:6,10 90:13,21 91:16 94:11,19 102:24 104:12 104:18 105:14 105:23 106:8 106:15 107:5 114:18,20 133:15 prescriptions 28:19 105:15 106:9 136:15 136:19 present 6:11 16:18 32:9 45:24 52:24 90:18 preserved 47:7 pressure 68:24 pretty 49:21</p>	<p>previous 37:7 previously 22:11,15,21 23:23 28:2 34:10 39:3 54:23 143:12 price 27:9 43:13 76:18 85:19,22 86:15 86:20,20 87:2 87:12 88:23 89:19 91:20 94:21 105:9,12 105:23 106:14 107:4 109:13 129:9,21,21 130:6 prices 15:18,24 17:7 18:2 76:21 87:8 92:4 109:8 129:15,16 133:2,8,18 pricing 133:17 134:4 primary 136:23 137:3,9 printed 9:24 prior 26:14 65:2 152:4 probably 48:13 90:8 113:11 124:3 146:6,13 problem 58:22 87:20 91:13</p>
---	--	--	---

[procedure - purpose]

Page 29

procedure 49:22 50:16 52:3 129:2	130:4,18 141:16 142:2 143:2,12	program 92:25 93:8,14	provisions 124:8 126:10 126:15 130:22
proceeding 11:20 14:18 26:11 30:20 31:9	product 27:20 29:10,20 43:2 68:4 73:8,11 74:17 111:23 115:6 128:25 137:12	programmatically 29:15	pst 1:16
proceedings 14:10,13 151:16 152:11	production 22:17 23:24 24:3 26:6,14,15 26:20 34:24 39:9 44:12 45:25 46:15 74:22 121:10 144:13	progressed 78:20	public 2:10 90:19 156:19
process 29:25 51:25 76:18 77:6 82:9 100:22 107:17 117:10	products 1:8 28:20 29:3 49:8,14,18 64:20 65:9 66:15 68:23 69:23 71:16 128:20	projected 94:23 102:14 103:5	publications 21:7
processed 52:16 137:7	professional 2:9 152:3	proper 11:16	pull 122:2 149:23
processes 15:15 136:14	profit 92:21 97:10 102:11 102:12 103:11 104:17	properly 15:23 130:15	purchase 29:20 45:11 64:7 67:13 68:17 89:19 98:7,7 113:6 137:9
processing 15:2 47:3,11,15 52:13 112:23 112:25 114:4 137:10	professionally 92:17	proprietary 130:4,15,16 132:6,11,18,21	purchased 62:8 62:11,20 87:9 94:25 107:23 109:15 115:6
processor 136:23 137:4,6 137:13,14,19	profitably 92:17	prospective 107:14	purchases 24:21 61:22 62:17,22 80:8 82:7 107:15 109:2,10 136:24
produce 142:12	profits 93:8 103:24	protecting 93:7	purely 28:12
produced 23:6 23:18 24:17 26:24 28:24 33:23 34:17,19 43:5 44:6,11 54:23 58:8 64:6 82:23		protective 130:20,23	purport 69:23
		provide 17:14 52:14 110:14 110:25 116:3 117:20 124:17	purpose 14:18 28:12 38:18 42:21 43:16 56:16 59:24 78:3 87:22 88:6,15 89:24 93:18 96:7 100:6 146:20
		provided 11:4 22:23 23:21 25:21 27:6 38:16 62:15 65:4,18,25 90:13 112:2,3 127:11 128:10 128:13	
		providing 50:23	
		provision 116:21	

[purposes - record]

Page 30

<p>purposes 8:17 10:9 98:25 pursuant 2:6 24:13 97:14 130:19 put 50:14 64:9 64:11,13 66:25 68:13 77:9 100:25 102:21 putting 21:10 48:17,22 52:5 53:2 122:16 135:2</p>	<p>questions 8:6 9:13 83:2 96:2 124:2 133:22 146:25 147:3 147:14 151:10 quick 70:12 quite 8:15 51:12 80:22 96:18 149:18 quote 121:15</p>	<p>raw 52:19 reach 17:4,24 reaching 52:19 read 55:16 61:20 148:18 148:21 151:12 154:9 156:5 readily 27:15 reading 121:15 really 8:9 36:18 64:22 76:15 77:4 82:16 reason 89:22 113:20 138:5 154:11 155:6,9 155:12,15,18 155:21 reasons 73:5 89:20 96:4 rebates 111:14 111:21,22 112:2,3 rebuttal 16:17 recall 22:7 25:24 26:18 27:10 32:4 33:8,18 36:18 48:10,15 51:25 52:25 53:10,11 65:17 135:15 137:23 138:3 147:14 149:15 149:22 150:15 recalls 37:12</p>	<p>receipt 154:18 receive 85:12 received 23:7 24:5 25:10 26:7 32:15 35:7,22 40:4 44:8 105:15,24 110:15,20 111:2 122:6 131:11 134:21 148:3 recent 9:23 11:2 19:16 21:14,21 22:4 22:16 26:14 36:8 39:10 141:9 144:13 recently 38:16 recess 70:25 144:23 recognize 36:7 40:11 108:16 122:14 134:24 recognized 90:18 recognizing 108:17 recollection 150:10 record 7:3,14 8:11 23:22 33:25 35:4 43:11 47:7 70:24 71:4 77:15 78:5</p>
<p>q</p>	<p>r</p>		
<p>quality 66:4,13 67:3,19,24 quantity 45:18 query 29:23 31:17 32:7 question 9:17 13:11 17:21 18:9 33:13 34:7 38:6 39:2 51:21 54:10 55:16 60:20 65:14,21 66:15 67:4 71:8,22 81:14 86:24 98:14 101:15 102:9 106:21 111:20 125:22 132:14,25 134:10,14 138:5</p>	<p>r 1:13 2:3 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:19,19,19 12:10,10 152:1 152:6 153:2 154:5 155:2,3,3 155:24 156:2,4 156:12 raise 71:22 raised 71:25 range 23:10 97:8,12 102:4 117:20 138:2 ranges 25:18 48:12 91:10 141:2 raspanti 5:5 rate 129:13 rates 128:3,19 128:24 129:3,6 rather 102:8 124:6 143:23 ratto 1:24 2:7 7:12 152:2,24</p>		

[record - renewals]

Page 31

122:12 124:20 126:24 131:21 134:17 144:22 145:2 recorded 7:6 29:17 112:16 records 58:18 59:13,17,19,24 75:23 76:21 82:14 114:4 138:22 recovery 3:20 redacted 128:5 128:8,13,15 130:2,15 131:8 131:10 redaction 128:9 redactions 130:7 131:7 redirect 147:9 147:10 153:4 reduce 14:19 refer 89:9 121:24 reference 12:9 61:5 150:2 referenced 23:15 37:25 150:2 154:6 referred 25:8 85:5,14 110:20 referring 34:25 72:25 84:18 124:15	refers 87:23 120:9 reflected 127:4 reflecting 124:18 refresh 150:9 refreshed 150:19 refund 112:6 112:11,21 113:11 114:17 refunds 111:14 111:21 112:4,5 113:13 114:21 114:25 115:4 reg 146:6,8 regard 84:12 regarding 7:7 112:2 regardless 56:6 108:10 registered 2:9 152:3 regulated 56:18 regulation 67:15 70:2 85:8 146:11 regulators 56:21 regulatory 84:14 rehabilitation 13:12 reimbursed 87:10 129:11	reimbursement 128:3,19,24 129:18 133:8 reimburseme... 98:22 reinsurance 108:14,17 109:12,21 relate 15:17 related 12:13 12:21 13:4 15:15 17:22 30:7 41:8 48:5 49:19 60:17 72:14,19 73:15 100:16 139:11 147:17 relates 123:22 relationship 53:16 55:24 56:4 57:6 125:17 126:12 127:2 relationships 124:12,16 relative 152:16 152:19 relator 15:10 15:13 relator's 15:21 relay 78:15 relevance 47:22 77:5 133:4 relevant 42:14 46:2,5,12 47:18	48:6,8 62:3 63:4,14 74:4 79:6 82:3 98:14 99:7 139:18 144:14 reliably 81:3,9 relied 22:12 37:2,7,10 38:9 49:2,3,15 50:3 135:10,13,18 136:4 rely 38:7 48:16 48:21 50:10,22 52:4 relying 48:19 remember 20:6 22:5 53:13 65:3 remembered 150:13 reminders 8:16 remotely 10:7 removed 30:8 30:12,14 renamed 148:2 148:15 149:7 149:10 151:2 153:24 renaming 149:3 renee 4:15 renewal 122:23 renewals 124:15
---	---	---	---

[repeat - retained]

Page 32

repeat 55:16	87:21 95:24	19:20 20:11	respective
repeatedly	96:12,15 99:12	99:14 117:19	122:22
82:20 96:12	100:7,11,15,21	137:16,25	respond 9:16
rephrase 40:24	100:24 101:5	represent 7:25	17:12 99:22
106:10	113:22 115:10	21:8 108:24	responding
reply 16:17	116:20 119:22	138:15	17:2 66:24
report 9:23	121:24 122:16	representations	96:3
10:17 11:2,6,14	122:19 123:24	142:16	response 34:3
11:17,20 12:12	124:4,9 126:12	representative	66:10 67:16
12:20 13:5,6,10	127:9 133:23	32:4	responses
15:4,23 16:4,9	135:2 136:12	representatives	38:22 69:21
16:10,11,22	139:6 140:12	22:10 32:3	responsibilities
17:7 18:2	146:15,17,20	represented	15:3,16 57:8
19:11,12,16,23	149:25 150:21	23:23 25:20	responsibility
19:24 20:12,17	153:8,11	131:2	59:10 97:22,24
21:15,16,20,21	reported 1:23	representing	responsible
22:4,4 23:12,13	24:21 49:6	7:10 62:15	34:8
23:18 25:9,10	62:23 72:2	125:9 149:21	responsibly
27:19 30:3	79:14 81:6	represents	93:6
35:5,12,17,20	86:23 111:9	23:14 61:24	responsive
35:25 36:8,17	138:14,16	reprocessed	33:22 100:11
37:3,6,8 38:2	reporter 2:8,9	114:10	restart 88:12
38:10,15,25	7:11,15 9:2	request 34:6	110:22
39:7,11,16,20	88:11 152:3	101:4	restate 125:21
41:14,18 42:8	reporter's 8:20	requests 33:11	restricted
48:18,23 49:10	9:9	33:15,22	30:17 31:7
50:5,24 52:6,15	reporting 15:2	required 55:7	restricting
53:2 56:21,22	15:16,18 27:22	58:23 83:18	31:11,15
59:2 60:3,4,8	56:25 57:8	86:22 156:13	result 90:15
60:25 61:3,4,15	58:23 59:9	requirements	104:12 112:18
64:18 65:3,8,12	84:9 109:8,13	73:8	resulting 96:25
66:2,10,25	139:3,13,18,25	requires 119:23	retain 93:4
67:17 72:6	reports 11:24	residual 101:24	retained 10:21
73:6,14,17,18	14:21,24 16:7	resolution	13:20 15:8
73:24 74:2,25	16:23 17:2,9,15	14:20	19:3 43:20,25

[retained - see]

Page 33

102:14 110:2 139:10 retention 84:10 return 154:13 154:17 reveal 42:25 revealed 49:4 revenue 92:15 reversals 112:15 113:19 113:25 114:13 reversed 112:20 113:24 114:9 review 28:10 28:11 29:7 30:16 33:14 43:22 51:4 116:14 117:6 148:24 154:7 reviewed 21:14 21:15 30:5 33:19 38:17 39:13 64:19 66:11 79:8 111:12 113:18 114:12 115:11 115:23 121:10 122:16 134:25 138:13 145:18 145:23 reviewing 39:20 42:3 43:16 50:17 52:25	right 10:4,12 10:14,18 12:17 12:18,24 16:7 18:16 19:14 24:24 25:13 30:9 37:4,8,13 39:22 46:18 47:2,15 50:6 56:10 57:17 58:3 59:13 61:7 63:5,16,23 64:4 65:15,16 65:20 71:17 72:12 73:2 74:2 81:12,13 81:21 82:14,18 83:9,10,15 101:3 102:7 103:25 106:23 115:18 122:25 123:7 131:3 134:7 136:6 144:5 146:13 149:15,22 150:5 rise 92:5 risk 91:5,7,8 93:4 96:13 97:4,17 102:2,5 103:3 105:3 rivero 3:21 role 91:25 rolls 57:3 room 9:21 10:4	rooney 4:20 roughly 22:18 routinely 132:22 138:16 rows 114:3 rpr 1:24 152:24 rule 119:8 rules 85:3 running 102:19	school 120:15 science 95:14 110:7 sciences 19:18 20:23 scope 49:11 50:18 51:2 60:24 137:24 screen 32:17 81:24 148:7,9 148:22 scripts 6:4 24:24 25:6 115:12 119:24 121:5,17 122:4 123:12 124:24 125:14,16,18 126:6,20,22 130:25 131:16 132:11 133:18 134:19 136:14 153:17,20 scroll 35:15 36:4 148:18 se 5:15 52:11 seal 17:9,16 second 31:21 35:14 42:9 75:5,21 76:2 secondary 98:10 security 91:3 see 20:14 27:7 32:21,23 33:4 33:10,12 35:10
		s 3:1,9 4:1 5:1 6:1 12:9 153:6 155:3 safe 130:9 sake 8:20 9:9 sale 87:13 sales 69:22 70:2 sat 12:15,23 savings 104:6,7 saw 44:11 85:24 140:25 saying 17:13 68:7 69:9 88:8 105:8 140:24 144:12 149:3 says 42:13 66:2 68:15 96:12 101:5 120:14 122:20 123:10 124:23 126:21 128:5,7 142:20 150:25 schedule 16:13 scheduled 18:22	

[see - slight]

Page 34

36:25 41:14 42:15,19 43:4,9 44:7 51:10,15 51:16 54:22 60:13 61:4,5 62:25 63:8 64:25 65:10 75:5 79:13 86:10 93:24 113:19 114:3 114:13,20 116:24 120:5 120:18 122:20 123:2,9,18 127:20,23,25 129:14 133:2 135:5 136:13 136:17,25 138:8,14 141:25 142:9 142:22 148:9 seeing 34:8 seeks 89:2 seen 33:6 118:20 127:10 141:8,12,14,24 segmented 29:9 32:10 selection 65:7 91:25 sell 69:7 sells 69:4 senior 90:9 134:20 153:21	sense 52:14 114:18 sensitive 132:22 sent 40:17 154:14 sentence 138:24 142:19 separate 14:3 53:25 56:8,16 56:19 57:16,21 58:9,25 111:6 139:23 144:14 separately 55:5 55:8 78:12 separateness 57:7 september 41:13 42:6 140:16,17 sequence 137:6 series 92:12 serious 68:9 served 34:3 38:21 services 83:15 117:21 set 14:10 18:24 23:24 28:24 47:23 84:13 85:3 105:14 106:9 111:7 113:9 129:7,8 130:5 152:14	sets 59:23 76:18,24,25 seven 26:22 several 34:17 share 27:3 32:24 80:3,17 101:25 103:20 103:24 137:17 148:6 shared 47:8 96:17 97:13 103:6 104:8 shares 80:25 90:17 sharing 96:24 97:4 102:2 103:14 104:17 sheet 154:11 shop 28:9 31:13 show 32:21 showing 81:24 shown 113:12 sick 92:3 sickest 92:2 side 57:13 97:8 103:8 sides 16:15,16 sign 68:14 151:12 154:12 signature 135:5 152:24 signed 154:20 similar 42:17 113:9	similarities 73:16,19 simple 31:16 62:13 simply 25:21 29:14 46:7 59:2 68:11 90:20 93:16 96:11 105:7 114:4 127:7 137:16 simultaneous 16:14,15 simultaneously 43:8 76:25 single 32:6 91:17 117:8 118:19 137:8 singles 89:13 singling 96:5 singular 13:9 sit 62:6 81:16 sits 78:7 80:12 sitting 25:23 63:18 72:5 81:7 105:20 132:15 141:7 six 140:16 skadden 5:21 skadden.com 5:25 skilled 51:5 slate 5:21 slight 61:19
---	--	---	---

[slightly - stanoch]

Page 35

<p>slightly 16:20 27:16 54:18 61:18 small 26:21 80:22 109:25 smaller 49:13 101:18 136:23 social 91:3 solco 63:9 sold 29:20 98:17 solutions 2:6 154:23 somewhat 47:4 sorry 9:5 12:5 15:11 18:23 20:15 30:13 51:11,18 53:22 54:10 55:12,15 79:19 81:11 82:11 84:5 127:15 145:13 sort 45:4 54:2 57:23 129:13 129:24 sound 9:9 71:12 sounds 12:6 97:18 150:24 source 92:15 94:6 98:10 99:24 139:2 sourced 24:10 30:6 82:24</p>	<p>sources 89:9,13 southern 13:15 space 92:18 speak 15:12 121:12 special 73:8 83:21,25 95:12 specialist 6:13 specific 28:19 44:21 45:3 51:24 59:8 82:22 83:22 89:16 92:22 106:18 128:19 129:15 136:18 144:3 146:17 specifically 27:7,24 30:6 31:3 57:12 67:24 73:10 74:4 76:5 78:3 82:3 88:5,13 90:7,22 95:16 140:25 141:13 146:22 specifics 45:10 specified 129:9 speculating 36:21 46:7 speculation 100:19 spelled 12:8 spent 41:6 spiral 91:24</p>	<p>split 77:6 79:16 119:14,19 sponsor 55:4 77:13 97:2,9,15 97:19 98:6,11 101:10 102:15 103:4,12,16,23 105:7 109:22 109:25 117:11 118:6,12,21 126:13 145:4 145:12,15 sponsor's 77:16 sponsoring 118:8 sponsors 55:6 83:9,12 84:3,8 84:16 85:12,17 86:14,16,23 87:11 88:22 89:15 96:13 99:15 118:14 124:17 st 6:7 stage 29:21 staley 19:18 20:23 stamped 122:13 134:17 stamps 135:17 standard 28:14 43:10 49:22 50:16 83:16,20 94:10 119:13 120:3 126:10</p>	<p>129:25 standards 121:9 stanoch 3:7 17:17 18:3 21:19,23 22:24 30:10 33:16,24 34:20 37:24 38:20 40:20 41:19 42:23 44:2 46:19 47:16 48:24 50:7 52:7 53:3 54:8 56:11 57:18 58:4,15 59:14 63:24 66:21 67:21 69:16 86:4,11 86:18 87:17 88:9,17 99:4 100:8,18 101:7 101:13 104:2 104:20 105:17 106:3,5,16 107:6 110:8,17 111:4,16 114:14 115:2 115:25 118:16 119:6 124:20 125:8,21 126:7 126:23 128:21 130:17 131:18 131:22 132:13 132:19 134:9 134:12 135:20</p>
--	--	---	---

[stanoch - summacare]

Page 36

136:7 140:8 141:22 143:4 143:20 147:5,8 147:10 151:7 151:11 153:5 154:1 start 11:10 108:2 started 8:10 36:16,22 41:17 41:24 96:3 103:9 starting 42:11 starts 37:11 60:11 state 8:11 56:21 116:20 119:22 stated 67:16 statement 104:23 134:14 137:14 142:11 statements 97:16 states 1:1 115:10 statistic 48:7 statistics 42:14 48:8,17,22 49:3 49:4 50:4,10,15 status 91:4 statute 85:8 statutory 84:14 stenographic 7:14	stenographic... 152:12 step 52:18 77:4 steps 108:23 store 113:5,10 story 96:16 stoy 5:9 street 3:5,14 4:13,21 5:6,22 strenuously 67:9 stress 132:24 strike 37:19 48:18,20 63:20 79:19 106:9 110:5,11 116:12 117:24 128:11 structural 84:22 structure 14:3 16:17 47:10 54:3 56:3,6 88:4 93:18 114:7 structured 87:6 structures 84:14 85:5 studied 69:20 146:3 study 80:23 sub 127:22 subdivision 74:21	subject 13:6 14:23 15:5 16:10,12 17:3 18:5 28:22 44:25 49:9 73:7 147:2 subjects 74:4 submitted 15:19,24 21:16 146:14,19 subparts 75:14 subscribed 156:14 subsequently 112:19 subsidiaries 56:15 88:7 100:17 subsidiary 57:5 124:3 subsidies 84:15 85:12,16 86:13 87:2,6,7,22,24 88:8,16 92:14 93:12,20 95:19 98:21 105:15 105:23 106:22 107:11 109:11 110:14,25 subsidized 93:22 94:22 subsidy 84:19 87:12,15 98:5 106:12,19 107:2,13	108:12,15 109:12,21 substance 11:22 13:4,13 16:19 44:24 95:19 151:6 substantive 41:25 substantively 120:20 substitute 92:10 93:14,20 108:4 121:18 sufficient 71:10 93:4,13 142:21 sufficiently 92:25 suggests 85:2 summa 30:18 31:8,23 32:3,8 46:6 53:13 72:3 77:8,13 84:3 85:18 86:15 87:16 102:6 103:23 104:11 105:9 105:13,24 106:13 107:3 110:15 111:2 115:22 118:14 138:7,12 145:5 summacare 22:9 24:12,22 25:2 26:11,15 28:18 30:7
--	--	--	---

[summacare - testimony]

Page 37

31:2 45:7,22 49:7 53:9 59:20 61:11,21 62:9,16 78:4 81:20 82:4,7,12 83:8,12 85:11 98:24 99:2 115:13 120:24 121:17,19 122:22 134:6 140:7,20 141:9 141:19 143:19 summaries 50:20 summarize 51:6 52:23 60:6 summary 27:25 summation 87:8 supplant 92:15 supplement 44:6 47:24 supplemental 100:15 supplied 16:23 22:15,21,25 23:2,16,25 24:3 24:12 26:3,17 28:2,15 29:3,16 29:17 32:20 34:10,11 42:3 49:5,17,19 55:3 64:15 88:21 137:12,16,25	138:6,11 supply 79:4 113:21 support 52:21 suppose 58:17 113:15 supposed 125:13 sure 11:13 23:8 33:21 36:6 46:13 49:25 51:13 55:5 57:10 75:9,23 98:20 101:20 105:21 118:5 126:16 132:8 133:24 134:13 142:3 surrounding 145:19 survey 70:4 surveys 70:9 suspect 112:2 swear 7:16 sworn 7:20 152:6 156:14 symmetric 97:4 systems 57:4 t t 7:19 12:9,10 152:1,1 153:6 155:3,3 tab 32:12 35:2 35:19 39:24 122:2 125:7	134:15 tables 42:15 48:7 51:9,14,22 52:5,11,11,22 53:2 tabulate 50:18 50:19 take 19:17 35:14 53:6 68:6 70:12,17 97:10 104:10 104:15 111:19 113:7 114:19 131:5 136:10 144:18 148:17 taken 70:25 144:23 150:16 152:11 takes 57:2 77:21 129:4 talk 8:24 9:6,7 61:3 132:9 141:5 talked 19:5 53:12 talking 49:12 53:9 57:11 103:9 106:19 120:12 139:16 139:21 talks 96:16 133:6 tape 119:25 120:2,7,9,11,16	tapes 120:14 target 90:22 targeting 95:11 teleconference 2:5 tell 10:24 13:5 14:23 20:10 34:22 62:21 74:12 113:11 116:4 123:20 133:13 148:19 telling 108:15 tells 96:16 133:14 ten 75:15 tens 105:5 term 47:4 84:25 88:21 113:15 124:16 terminated 13:16 termination 11:21 terminations 13:4 terms 28:14 84:21 120:21 130:2 134:5 testified 20:2 139:8 150:23 testifies 7:21 testify 152:6 testimony 11:4 20:9,16,22 21:3 50:8 154:9,18
---	--	---	---

[testimony - transactions]

Page 38

156:8 teva 5:12 19:14 19:21 29:4 61:10 63:3,13 64:23 texas 4:14 thank 8:8 12:11 21:10 36:14 40:9 51:17 61:15 70:21 86:4,7 147:13 148:11 151:8 theory 71:18 thing 91:17 94:15 129:13 things 26:24 38:3 45:4 76:11 112:8 think 18:9 39:2 45:23 49:2 50:9 68:11,24 71:23 72:8 79:5 87:19,19 87:25 89:20,22 93:17 95:4,15 95:23 96:4 98:13 99:7,16 99:22 100:12 102:8 107:10 108:12 110:21 111:18 112:11 112:21,22 113:12 122:3 139:17 146:23 151:11	third 26:8 43:14 75:5 76:15,17,17 77:7 102:5 115:22 116:8 116:15 131:17 131:25 thorough 135:24 thousands 105:5 three 27:3 29:4 53:11 64:21,22 71:13 75:8 135:17 threshold 78:24 80:16 108:8,22 109:4,16 thrown 54:20 tier 76:5 tiffany 5:17 tim 21:15 time 8:9 9:12 14:19 21:11 34:14 41:3,6,8 41:16,21 44:16 49:10,16 63:14 70:22 71:2 78:7 87:13 90:9 116:23 118:23,24 119:5 123:23 129:4 137:21 144:20,24 145:22,24	146:5,9 147:2 147:21,21 151:10,13 152:13 154:19 timeframe 154:8 timely 34:3 times 8:15 51:15 title 148:12 titled 128:2 titling 11:16 today 8:4,9,17 9:21 10:4 19:5 21:13 25:23 36:13 38:19 39:8 41:7 63:18 72:5 81:7 98:21 105:20 132:15 141:7 150:23 today's 151:14 together 48:17 48:22 52:5 53:2 64:10,12 64:14 77:10 122:16 135:2 told 55:24 67:11 took 20:18 67:5 top 26:18 127:21 torrent 4:11 7:25 29:5 61:10 63:3,13	64:23 total 71:19 96:20,22 totally 71:21 toward 41:12 61:15 tower 4:21 tpp 47:8 59:19 113:21 121:22 tps 121:23 trace 105:22 106:8,12,25 traced 24:18 107:22 tracing 105:12 track 43:11 59:4,5 78:17 114:25 tracked 55:5 78:12 tracking 56:17 tracleer 11:15 12:10 trade 4:21 transaction 27:9 45:10,13 45:14 77:18 79:22 98:8,10 112:17 113:2 114:8 129:4 139:3 transactions 25:19,22 31:23 49:7 50:21 62:16 109:14
---	--	---	---

[transactions - use]

Page 39

111:7 113:10 137:17 transcript 152:11 154:6 154:20 156:5,8 transferred 112:18 transforms 89:17 traurig 5:14 treated 76:4 trial 14:13 28:23 29:2 31:9 66:20 132:9 trials 20:2 tried 86:5 triple 142:24 trivial 62:21 troop 78:10,13 78:16 80:7 trouble 55:13 true 59:17 78:10 89:6 96:19 97:21 102:22 109:8 111:25 152:10 156:8 truly 58:12 truth 60:17 75:13 112:12 152:7,7,8 try 8:24 9:6,7 72:9 83:5 138:18	trying 19:9 23:4,8 75:17 86:24 118:9,18 125:11 126:16 turn 10:7 turned 113:6 two 11:24 13:14 14:3,21 14:24 16:6 19:9,20 21:24 22:8 25:16 31:18,22 32:20 56:9 58:2,8 76:16 77:9 89:20 91:3 96:4,9,10,11 117:12 124:9 149:16,23 150:22 type 29:16 43:7 43:24 119:19 types 26:2 43:19 87:24 98:22 typically 80:22 111:22 113:22 114:9 129:17	unacceptable 66:16 67:19,20 under 17:9,15 55:8 84:22 97:24 101:2 127:22 129:10 129:18 underlying 25:19 87:21 88:6,15 understand 9:13 17:19,23 18:9 23:5 24:16 26:10 46:14 50:2,17 57:11 63:12 68:20 69:25 71:14 94:20 105:7 125:12 125:23 126:14 133:3,16 134:3 139:15 understanding 19:7 23:17 24:25 25:4 28:25 43:6,17 49:24 50:25 53:15 61:7 98:20 117:7 142:7 understands 125:20 understood 9:18 83:4	undertake 95:3 undertaken 139:20 140:3 undertook 28:11 unintelligible 101:14 unique 89:16 unit 7:5 70:23 71:3 144:21,25 united 1:1 universe 49:12 49:14 unmarked 9:24 unquestionably 109:6 unreal 68:25 unusual 124:11 unusually 108:19 update 32:21 updated 11:3 26:8 30:24 upside 93:9 upside down 10:8 usa 5:13 usable 49:6 usage 95:5,7 use 10:8 36:10 58:8 67:2,23,25 76:7 80:16 84:25 89:10 91:8 98:23 101:20 113:15
	u		
	u 7:19 u.s. 136:15 ultimate 87:16 ultimately 13:16 24:10 85:18 101:11		

[use - woolsey]

Page 40

114:17 117:8 117:23 118:2 118:14,25 119:4,10,16 132:20 used 29:25 31:22,24 43:11 44:21 47:4 56:25 67:4 79:12 89:8,15 98:14 113:5 154:20 uses 24:23 25:2 54:13 73:3 88:20 using 28:16 57:3 59:6 76:12 82:20 95:14 109:12 116:23 118:21 129:8,19 usual 129:12	value 27:14,22 47:21 67:6 68:4,5,10,22 71:7,23,25 72:10 99:16 values 27:24 72:7 80:7 113:2 138:14 variance 97:12 various 107:11 vcd 136:24 vendor 120:2 verbal 8:18 verify 58:11 62:6 140:4 154:9 veritext 2:5 7:10 154:14,23 veritext.com 154:15 version 36:10 36:11 versus 12:2 14:22 19:14,18 19:21 20:23 58:20 76:8 vicinity 42:4 video 6:12 7:6 videoconfere... 1:14 videographer 7:2,11 70:22 71:2 144:20,24 151:13	videotape 1:12 2:3 33:3 virtually 2:4 virtue 85:7 vis 20:8,8 visible 95:18 vulnerable 92:8 w w 4:21 5:24 wait 131:13 want 17:20 32:19 36:10 39:17 45:8,12 45:13,15,16,17 45:18 46:13 49:25 50:14 54:17 57:10 60:15 70:18 75:9 81:2 82:22 84:25 91:19 94:14 98:19,23 108:3 114:19 121:14 121:21 130:2 131:14 132:8 133:23 142:24 wanted 43:4 75:6 86:3 131:20 warnings 69:22 warranted 135:24 way 29:10 34:15 47:25 50:11 51:3	58:10 65:11 75:21 79:21 87:5 93:12 95:2,17 104:9 125:24 126:3 130:12 131:19 ways 27:23 we've 70:10 144:16 week 34:16 weeks 146:6,12 weight 50:15 108:13 went 22:13 31:14 98:23 113:4 west 4:6 whatsoever 133:4,19 whichever 36:12 whiteley 3:4 whitely 3:9 wholesale 129:9 wilson 3:13 wipe 113:3 witness 7:16 17:18 18:4 42:24 70:15,19 86:9 153:2 154:8,10,12,19 wonder 133:12 woolsey 13:18
v			
v 154:4 155:1 156:1 vague 22:25 23:3 107:7 valsartan 1:7 7:7 21:2 61:9 61:25 66:5 70:6 71:6 72:15,20 105:2 107:23 136:19 154:4 155:1 156:1			

[word - à]

Page 41

word 19:17 50:19 67:2,3,23 89:7,7 112:6 114:17 118:25 121:18 132:20 words 28:23 63:10 71:13 79:14 work 36:22 41:24 42:25 52:3 117:17 146:2 worked 145:4,6 workflow 52:2 working 36:16 41:17 works 97:11 world 69:2 worldwide 19:14 worried 86:2 writing 100:25 written 21:6 143:7 wrong 19:9 37:17 72:9 89:21,23 96:6 96:14 97:17 98:19 wrote 32:6 143:7,9	xi01165 2:8 xponent 42:13 48:6,9 137:11 137:12,15,18 137:25	zydus 19:13,21 20:17 21:5
		à
		à 20:8
	y	
	y 95:6 yeah 30:21 65:10 69:11 96:11 101:21 111:18 year 96:22 100:13 105:6 107:25 109:17 129:18 140:16 years 69:21 91:3 116:24 yesterday 21:18,22 york 123:13,14 125:2,3 149:5 150:5	
	z	
	z 95:7 zachary 5:24 zachary.martin 5:25 zalman 3:24 zhp 5:20 29:5 61:10 63:3,8,10 63:13 64:24 zmick 4:8 zoom 1:14 2:4	
x		
x 1:5,10 95:4 108:9 153:1,6		

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

Rule 30

(e) Review By the Witness; Changes.

(1) Review; Statement of Changes. On request by the deponent or a party before the deposition is completed, the deponent must be allowed 30 days after being notified by the officer that the transcript or recording is available in which:

(A) to review the transcript or recording; and

(B) if there are changes in form or substance, to sign a statement listing the changes and the reasons for making them.

(2) Changes Indicated in the Officer's Certificate. The officer must note in the certificate prescribed by Rule 30(f)(1) whether a review was requested and, if so, must attach any changes the deponent makes during the 30-day period.

DISCLAIMER: THE FOREGOING FEDERAL PROCEDURE RULES ARE PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

THE ABOVE RULES ARE CURRENT AS OF APRIL 1, 2019. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION.

VERITEXT LEGAL SOLUTIONS
COMPANY CERTIFICATE AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Veritext Legal Solutions represents that the foregoing transcript is a true, correct and complete transcript of the colloquies, questions and answers as submitted by the court reporter. Veritext Legal Solutions further represents that the attached exhibits, if any, are true, correct and complete documents as submitted by the court reporter and/or attorneys in relation to this deposition and that the documents were processed in accordance with our litigation support and production standards.

Veritext Legal Solutions is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of client and witness information, in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), as amended with respect to protected health information and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, as amended, with respect to Personally Identifiable Information (PII). Physical transcripts and exhibits are managed under strict facility and personnel access controls. Electronic files of documents are stored in encrypted form and are transmitted in an encrypted fashion to authenticated parties who are permitted to access the material. Our data is hosted in a Tier 4 SSAE 16 certified facility.

Veritext Legal Solutions complies with all federal and State regulations with respect to the provision of court reporting services, and maintains its neutrality and independence regardless of relationship or the financial outcome of any litigation. Veritext requires adherence to the foregoing professional and ethical standards from all of its subcontractors in their independent contractor agreements.

Inquiries about Veritext Legal Solutions' confidentiality and security policies and practices should be directed to Veritext's Client Services Associates indicated on the cover of this document or at www.veritext.com.